

The University of Chicago

THE TECHNIQUE OF EXPOSITION
IN ROMAN COMEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
1935

By
DONALD EUGENE FIELDS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1938

The University of Chicago

THE TECHNIQUE OF EXPOSITION
IN ROMAN COMEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1935

By

DONALD EUGENE FIELDS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1938



PREFACE

The purpose of this study of exposition in Plautus and Terence is (a) to assemble the expository material regardless of its position in a given play, and (b) to discover, as far as possible, the general principles of technique in the complexes of scenes at the beginning of the plays. A somewhat similar study of Greek tragedy has been made by Evelyn Spring ("A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy," HSCP, XXVIII (1917), 135-224); in Roman comedy no study of the whole field has been attempted; Leo's treatment of the exposition of the Plautine plays in the fourth chapter of his Plautinische Forschungen is incidental to his consideration of the prologues; with this exception discussion, to the best of my knowledge, has been confined to individual plays or to passing generalizations.

For citations from Plautus I have used the Oxford text edited by Lindsay; from Terence, the Oxford text edited by Kauer and Lindsay; from Menander, Jensen, Menandri reliquiae (Berlin, 1929).

I wish to thank Dr. Henry W. Prescott, of the University of Chicago, who suggested this study, and whose criticism has frequently kept me from going astray. All responsibility, however, for errors and for the opinions expressed is my own.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
I. THE CONTENT OF EXPOSITION IN GENERAL AND ITS RELATION TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE ACTION.	1- 92
II. THE TECHNIQUE OF EXPOSITION IN THE INTRODUCTORY COMPLEX OF SCENES.	93-200
1. The Structure of the Scenes and the Choice of Characters for Expository Purposes.	93-144
2. The Methods of Introducing Expository Material. .	145-178
3. The Motivation of Entrances	179-200

I

THE CONTENT OF EXPOSITION IN GENERAL AND ITS RELATION TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE ACTION

The outstanding difference between the problem faced by the ancient dramatist in presenting to his audience the situation in which his characters are involved, and that facing the modern playwright, has been clearly stated by Post.¹ He points out that both the ancient comic and the ancient tragic poet represent before the eyes of the spectators only the outcome of a situation, whereas the modern playwright usually, though not always, depicts to the audience its beginning, development, and culmination. With a few slight and negligible exceptions, a New Comedy, properly speaking, is only a *dénouement*. The ancient writer is thus immediately confronted with a more difficult problem of exposition than a modern: the latter has to explain only the relations of the several characters and can trust to the action itself to exhibit those complications in which the characters are already entangled before the opening of the play. In addition the ancient poet usually has to reckon with a more involved mesh of circumstances.

For the purposes of this chapter we shall define exposition as the relation of the facts and conditions that prevailed prior to the beginning of the play; we shall thus use the term

¹ C. R. Post, "The Dramatic Art of Menander," *Harvard Studies*, XXIV (1913), 126; cf. also Legrand, *Daos*, 1910, pp. 490-91; a comic poet's own estimate of his difficulties is expressed by Antiphanes, fr. 191 (Koch).

in its broad sense, in distinction from its use as a designation of the part of the play preceding the complication.

It may be said that there are in general two main types of expository technique. The dramatist may explain the situation completely in the opening scene or scenes of the play, leaving none of the presuppositions to be presented later. Or he may reveal only enough information at the beginning to render the action intelligible, and withhold various circumstances until a knowledge of them is necessary for the understanding of the action, or until the announcement of the circumstances is dramatically effective.

The fact that the ancient dramatist depended less for his effects upon surprise than does the modern playwright is obvious; it is evidenced, in the case of Plautus at least, by the use of explanatory prologues when the situation is at all complicated. As a result he is less loath to provide a complete statement of the situation early in the play, though we shall find, as a matter of fact, that the gradual revelation of antecedent events is employed to a considerable extent. The type of exposition employed may be influenced, too, by the situation itself, or by the course of the action, as we shall point out later.

In the following discussion we shall omit any detailed consideration of the prologues; our purpose is to study the technique used within the play itself, with special emphasis upon the scene-complex at the beginning of the play which is so often given primarily to exposition of the plot.

There are three plays in which the exposition is reduced to the lowest possible terms. In these plays the situation is known fully to at least one character, and the audience is put in

possession of the essential facts without delay.¹

The action of the Persa consists of the efforts of Toxilus, assisted by his friends Sagaristio and Saturio, to obtain the freedom of his sweetheart by defrauding the leno who owns her. Their purpose is achieved by selling to the leno the daughter of Saturio, a freeborn girl, as a war-captive, and then reclaiming her. The play ends with a banquet in celebration of their success.² The facts, as they are gathered from the play, may be stated as follows:

Toxilus, slave of Timarchides (501), during his master's absence abroad (29; cf. 498), is engaged in a love-affair (24-25, 43-44, 177-81, etc.) with a girl owned by a leno (81-82, etc.) who moved here from Megara not six months ago (137-38); as a result the leno is unacquainted with Toxilus' friend, Saturio, or with Saturio's daughter, a *virgo* (127-131), or with Sagaristio, a fellow-slave of Toxilus³, who, if we are to take his remark seriously, has been at the mills for over a year (20-22). The leno demands six hundred nummi for the girl's release (36, 116-18, 437, 852), and has refused to trust Toxilus except under oath (415-16, 432, 785); Toxilus had sworn to consummate the deal today (34, 401), and has been trying to raise a loan (5-6); he had approached Saturio yesterday in an attempt to borrow

¹We are interested, in this discussion, only in what we may term essential expository facts, i.e., facts affecting the situation at the opening of the play; this consideration not only eliminates matters of mere realistic detail, or facts introduced for various economic purposes, such as, e.g., the motivation of entrance or exit; it also eliminates facts that may, in a broad use of the term, be considered expository, but which are essential only in that they facilitate some phase or development in the course of the action. An illustration or two will make clear what we have in mind. In the Pseudolus (iv. 2 ff.) someone is needed to act as a substituted messenger who should be unknown to the leno. Charinus offers the use of a slave; this slave meets all the necessary requirements, for he has come to Charinus' father recently from Carystus, he has not been outside of the house, and has never visited in Athens before yesterday (Pseud. 729-31). Similarly in the Persa, in order that Toxilus may perpetrate his fraud, it is necessary that both Saturio and his daughter should be unknown to the leno; we learn definitely (Pers. 137-38) that the leno knows neither, since he came to Athens only six months ago. There are numerous other examples.

²For concise summaries of the plays of Plautus and Terence, and an analysis of their resemblances and differences, see Kent, "Variety and Monotony in Plautine Plots," Phil. Quart., II (1923), 164-72; 315; the Persa is analyzed, scene by scene, by Meyer, "De Plauti Persa," Comm. Phil. Ienenses, VIII, fasc. 1 [1907], 146-51.

six hundred nummi, and had explained the situation to him then (116-18).

Obviously the situation is very simple and the facts to be conveyed to the audience few. The exposition consists of one scene. The action begins with the second scene (1. 2) in which Saturio is introduced preparatory to the formation of the plot against the leno.

As the play opens Toxilus appears with a short monologue on the difficulties he has been experiencing in trying to raise a loan (cf. 5-6). His friend Sagaristio enters, soliloquizing on the duties of a faithful slave. They meet, and in the conversation which follows the circumstances are revealed: Toxilus, in the absence of his master (29), has fallen in love (24-25, 43-44), and has been trying unsuccessfully to raise a loan of six hundred nummi to procure his sweetheart's freedom (36); today is the day which decides whether she shall be free, or remain a slave for life (34).¹

The plot of the Asinaria, as the Prologus remarks (8), is quite simple. It is, as Leo² puts it, "developed entirely from its own presuppositions." The action portrays a dissolute father, husband of a rich wife, helping his son to cheat his mother and to secure his mistress in return for a first share in her favors. A slave is caused to impersonate the mother's steward, and to intercept a sum of money which is due her. At the last moment, however, a rival of the son for the girl's favor discovers the situa-

¹We do not learn until considerably later in the play why it is so essential to obtain the money today; not until the appearance of Dordalus (iii. 2) is it revealed that Toxilus had promised to pay him today (401); Dordalus had refused to trust him except under oath (415-16, cf. 432, 785). Toxilus' remark about the danger of his sweetheart's remaining a slave for life is probably merely a lover's exaggeration. For a similar late introduction of information see Most. 537-38, 630; cf. note, p.

²Plautinische Forschungen² (Berlin, 1912), p. 200.

tion and thwarts the old man's intention by revealing the circumstances to his wife. The facts of the case may be summarized as follows:

Argyrippus, the only son of Demaenetus (16), is having an affair with Philaenium, a meretrix, who, together with her mother (cf. 132), lives next door (52-53). Their love is mutual (141, 515, 539 ff., 631), but the amour has been entirely a commercial affair so far (171-72); Argyrippus has lavished considerable money, which he made at sea (135), upon them (141-44, 163); this money has now been spent (196); his presents are falling short of his promises (56), and he needs twenty minae (89, cf. 229-31, 532, etc.) to prevent the girl from being given to someone else (195). His funds are exhausted (189), though he still believes his credit is good (233).

Demaenetus, who is under the thumb (85-86) of a rich wife (87, cf. 898), is aware of his son's situation (52-53), as his son asked him today to supply him with some money (74-75); he approves of the fact that his slaves, Libanus and Leonida, are aiding his son (57-59); in order, as he claims (64 ff.),¹ to gain his son's affection, he is anxious to oblige him (83, cf. 103-4); he is willing to have Libanus cheat him (Demaenetus), his wife, or Saurea, his wife's dower-slave, who has more authority than he has (85-86), out of the necessary funds (96-97, cf. 362-66).

Some time since, Saurea had sold some Arcadian asses to a merchant from Pella (333-34, 397) for twenty minae (347-48, cf. 396, 468, 579). The messenger who is sent to pay Saurea for them (335-36, 347-48, 393-96) is acquainted with Demaenetus (349, 351-56), but does not know Saurea (348, 353, 464).

The essential exposition of the Asinaria is completed within the first scene. The play begins (i. 1) with a conversation between Demaenetus and his slave, Libanus. We learn that Demaenetus' son is having an affair with Philaenium, next door (52-53); that Libanus and his fellow-slave, Leonida, are helping the son in his amour, with Demaenetus' approval (57-59), since he wishes, as he says, to gain his son's affection (164-67); his son has already approached him for money (74-75), since his presents

¹Demaenetus' real reason for his interest in his son's affair appears late in the play (734-36), where we learn that his assistance is due to his desire to share in the favors of his son's mistress. For further examples of false impressions later corrected, see p. 47, n. 1.

have been falling short of his promises (56); Demaenetus is anxious that he should be supplied (83), and is willing that he himself, or his wife, or his wife's dower-slave (85-86) should be cheated out of the necessary funds (96-97); his son needs twenty minae (89). Libanus, at the end of the scene, starts to lay his plans. The whole situation, accordingly, is perfectly clear at the end of the first scene. The action begins directly afterwards (i. 2) with Argyrippus' quarrel with the mother of his sweetheart (i. 2, 3).¹

The Miles Gloriosus opens (i. 1) with a dialogue scene between Pyrgopolinices and his parasite, Artotrogus. The scene provides no expository information, but serves to get the play off with a hilarious start, and to characterize the Miles. The presuppositions are given completely in the deferred prologue (ii. 1) spoken by Palaestrio, a character of the play.²

¹The intrigue proper does not get underway until ii. 2, in which Leonida reports the arrival of the merchant from Pella. The scenes between Argyrippus and Cleareta can scarcely be said to advance the action. They serve, in the main, to illustrate the information given in the opening scene, and perhaps may be considered as more or less time-filling, to allow for the arrival of the merchant and the start of the plot against him (on illustrative scenes see p. 134, n. 1). Leo (ed. 1895-96, Vol. I) on Asin. 127 suggests, because of the inconsistencies between these scenes and vss. 89, 533, 574 (cf. 329), that these scenes may have been introduced from another play; cf. Fraenkel, Plaut. im Plautus (Berlin, 1922), p. 277. Havet ("Études sur Plaute, Asinaria I. La seconde et la troisième scènes et la composition générale," Revue de Philologie, XXIX (1905), 94 ff.) argues plausibly that the contradictions arising from these scenes are due to a mistake in the scene headings preceding vss. 127 and 153; instead of Argyrippus they should read Diabolus, Argyrippus' rival for the girl; he then interprets the scene from this point of view, and finds that the difficulties disappear. This view is opposed by Ahrens (De Plauti Asinaria, Diss. (Iena, 1907), pp. 13 ff.), who believes that the traditional assignment of roles is correct, and that the difficulties ordinarily seen are only apparent and can be removed by interpretation. The contamination hypothesis has recently been taken up anew by Hough (PAPA, LXIV (1933), p. lxiv).

²Leo, Pl. F. 2, pp. 214-15, comments upon the peculiarity of this prologue: "Der Miles . . . bedarf zwar eine solchen Orientierung des Zuschauers vor der Handlung, und keine Person ist

Pleusicles, a young man of Athens, while in the midst of an amour with a meretrix, was sent as a legatus to Naupactus. In his absence a Miles happened to come to Athens, met the girl, obtained the confidence of her mother, treacherously spirited away the daughter, and brought her here to Ephesus (88, 113, 384, 411, etc.) against her will (99-113). Palaestrio, Pleusicles' slave, when he learned of the affair, took ship to carry word to his master. But he was captured by pirates and presented to this same Miles (114-20), in whose service he has been for the past three years (350-51, cf. 95). Upon being taken to the Miles' house he saw Pleusicles' mistress, and learned that she still loved Pleusicles, and longed to escape from the Miles (120-28). Palaestrio thereupon sent a letter to Pleusicles by a merchant (129-33); Pleusicles came to Ephesus and is now stopping next door to the Miles, at the home of an old gentleman, his father's hospes (134-35), who is helping along the love affair in every way possible (136-37, cf. 610 ff.). Since the Miles gave the girl one room in which she alone was allowed to set foot (140-41), Palaestrio, at the suggestion of the old gentleman (144), has dug a hole through the wall of this room, so providing a secret (cf., e.g., 340) passage for her between the two houses (142-43, cf. 468, 173, 181, 255-56, etc.). The soldier has set a fellow-servant of Palaestrio's on guard over the girl (145-46, cf. 298, 305, 467). The Miles himself is in the service of King Seleucus (75), and is engaged in enrolling recruits (73-74, 75-76, cf. 948-49).

The action begins directly after the deferred prologue with the report (156 ff.) that Philocomasium and Pleusicles have been observed kissing by one of the Miles' servants (173-76, cf. 199, 243, 264, etc.) who turns out to be Sceledrus (272-75), the cellarius (823). No new essential information whatever appears after the beginning of the action.¹ Furthermore, there are very few resumptive references to facts mentioned in the prologue. As far as the presuppositions are concerned there are none.² There

geeigneter sie zu geben als Palaestrio; aber Palaestrio kann sie vollkommen geben, sei es im Monolog sei es im Gespräch mit einem anderen; das er aus der Rolle fällt und zum 'prologus' wird, ist in dem Verhältnis der Vorgeschichte zur Handlung nicht begründet, wie wir es in allen übrigen Stücken mit erzählenden prologus hierin begründet fanden."

¹The fact that Palaestrio has been in the service of the Miles for only three years (350-51), supplementing the statement in the prologue (95) that he has not been long in his present servitude, is the only case of what may be called further information which occurs in the play.

²The closest parallel to this lack of repetition in the play of information given in the prologue occurs in the Mercator. See below.

are a few references to the present situation; the hole-in-the-wall is mentioned eventually at line 468, after it has been used to fool Sceledrus in scenes ii. 3, 4, 5, during the course of which it has been referred to in vague terms (cf. 173, 181, 255-56, etc.); the information that Sceledrus had been appointed guard over the girl (Prol. 145-46) is repeated (cf. 298, 305, 467); the fact that Periplectomenus is cooperating with the lovers (Prol. 144) is obvious passim.

The Miles differs from the Persa and the Asinaria only in the larger amount of information given; this is necessitated by the peculiar situation at the opening of the play, which would not be clear to the audience without considerable explanation; the situation itself, apart from the circumstances leading up to it, is not at all involved.

We may include in a second group plays in which a less compact type of exposition is employed; the exposition, while complete before the beginning of the action, is spread over a varying number of scenes. In some cases this is rendered necessary by the structure of the situation; it may happen that no one character knows all the circumstances; or he may be prevented from revealing what he knows, in a dialogue scene, by the presence on the stage of others from whom he wishes to keep back the facts; or the delay in the revelation of certain circumstances may be due to the fact that the only person who knows them has not arrived, or returned, from abroad. In other instances of exposition spread over several scenes the reason must be sought in the author's interest in the depiction of character or of atmosphere; occasionally this is also a factor in plays where a certain spread in the exposition is demanded by the structure.

The spread in the exposition of the Mercator is determined

by the structure. The exposition consists of two scenes; the first gives the situation as far as it is known to Charinus; the second reports additional information which he is not in a position to know, due to the fact that he has not as yet met his father. The play represents a youth and his father as rivals for the favors of a slave-girl whom the youth has brought home from a trading-trip. The father, seeing the girl, and amorously attracted, insists that she be sold, and has one of his friends bid her in and take her home, since the latter's wife is in the country.¹ The friend's wife returns unexpectedly, suspects her husband of misconduct, and the true situation is revealed. The situation at the opening of the play is briefly as follows:

Charinus, after an absence of two years (12, cf. 533), has just returned yesterday (106, cf. 257, 481) from a trading trip to Rhodes, undertaken at the behest of his father (11-12, cf. 257, 356-57, 390); there he fell in love with a beautiful girl (13, *passim*), whom he bought and has brought back with him (106, cf. 180 ff.). Previously, on coming of age, he had become captivated by a local meretrix, and wasted his father's property on the leno, which resulted in his father's denouncing him and forbidding anyone to lend him money (40-52). After considerable good advice from his father (53-79) he decided to go on a trading trip to please him (80-83). His father built and outfitted a small Cyprian bark, counted out a talent of silver, and sent along a faithful slave (87-92). They arrived at Rhodes and disposed of the whole cargo at a large profit (93-97). In port there he met an old friend, who invited him to dinner, and at his home he met the girl with whom he is now in love (97-105). She has been his mistress for two years (533, cf. 215), and they have pledged faithfulness (536-536a). She is at present at the harbor, on board the ship, along with Charinus' servant (108, cf. 161-87); Charinus is anxious to keep his father from learning of her presence (107, cf. 189).

Demipho, father of Charinus, who has had a dream outlining the action of the play (225-51), visited the ship this morning (161 ff., 255 ff.), saw the girl (180-81, 260-61), and was told that Charinus had brought her as a present for his mother (201-2, 260-61); Demipho, accordingly, not suspecting that she is Charinus' mistress (215, 260-61), fell desperately in love (262-63, 304 ff., cf.

¹On the improbabilities connected with this sale, see Langen, Plaut. Studien (Berlin, 1886), pp. 161 ff.

187-88, 203).

Charinus had told the whole affair yesterday (481) to Eutychus, son of Lysimachus, his chum (474-75). Eutychus' mother is in the country for the day (279-80, 543, 586, etc.).

The Mercator opens (i. 1) with a prologue spoken by Charinus, a character of the play, who remains on the stage for the following scene with Acanthio. The presuppositions, as in the Miles, are given with almost unnecessary detail, as they have little bearing upon the action of the play; they are not repeated later; in this respect also the exposition of the Mercator bears a close resemblance to that of the Miles. In this prologue we learn the details of Charinus' past history, and as much of the present situation as he knows: he has brought back a slave-girl with whom he is in love (97-106), he has left her on the ship (108), and he is anxious that his father should not learn of her presence (107). In the following scene (i. 2) Acanthio, who had been left on the ship to guard the girl, arrives from the harbor, and the situation from the point of view of Charinus' father is presented. Acanthio reports that Demipho has visited the ship (187-88, 194), has seen the girl (161, 179, 181), has given evidence of being amorously attracted by her (203), and does not suspect that she is Charinus' mistress (215) as Acanthio told him that Charinus had bought the girl as a maid for his mother (201-2). The situation is now entirely clear to the audience, and the action begins with the following scene (ii. 1),¹ in which Demipho

¹Leo (Pl. F.2, p. 216) considers that the action begins with the appearance of Acanthio (i. 2), and accordingly regards the Mercator as the sole Plautine comedy in which the action begins directly after the prologue. However, in my opinion, i. 2 must still be regarded as exposition; the action of the play consists of the conflict between father and son, due to the difference in their understanding of the situation; i. 1 presents Charinus' view of the situation; i. 2 (supplemented by ii. 1) presents Demipho's understanding of it. The conflict does not actually get underway until the meeting of father and son in ii. 3.

appears with a monologue in which he relates a dream of the night before, which foreshadows the action of the play; he also tells of his visit to the ship and of his falling in love with the girl.¹

The exposition of the Pseudolus is likewise spread, due to the fact that, as in the Mercator, it is essential to present the situation from two points of view--from the point of view of Calidorus, and from that of Ballio; considerable atmosphere is also introduced. The action consists of the efforts of a slave to obtain for his young master a girl with whom the latter is in love; the girl is held by a leno who has already sold her to a Miles who has made a down payment; he is willing, however, to break his promise if the youth produces the money first. The youth's father makes a bet with the slave, promising to repay any money the slave should obtain by trickery, feeling sure that he would never have to make good. By intercepting a messenger from the Miles, obtaining his credentials, and substituting a spurious messenger, the girl is obtained and the old man loses his bet. The facts may be summarized as follows:

Calidorus is in love (15, 41, etc.) with a slave girl, a tibicina (482, 528) held by a leno (51-52, 225-27). He had given Ballio, the leno, money as long as he had it (257, cf. 305), and had promised him twenty minae for a certain day (279-80); however, he is now without funds (80-81, 96-97, 273, 299), and since he is less than twenty-five his credit is worthless (303-4, cf. 80). Ballio had taken a solemn oath that he would sell the girl to no one save Calidorus (352-53). However, some days ago (cf. 9-11) Calidorus received a letter from his sweetheart (cf. 35-36) telling him that the leno has sold her (cf. 342) for twenty minae (cf. 344) to a Macedonian Miles, Polymachaeroplaxides (988-89), from abroad (51-52, cf. 346, 616-17); before he departed the Miles paid him fifteen minae (cf. 346, 618); only five minae are now remaining unpaid (53-54, cf. 373,

¹This scene resembles scenes 1, 2, 3 of the Asinaria, in that it serves principally to illustrate the information given in the previous scene. See p. 134, n. 1. For a review of the discussion of Merc. 11. 1 see Enk, "De mercatore Plautina," Mnemos., LIII (1925), 57-71; Plauti Mercator (Lugduni, Sijthoff, 1932), pp. 7-21.

619, 1149); on that account the Miles left here a token (55)--his own likeness impressed on wax by his ring (56, cf. 986, 1000-1002, 1202)--with the arrangement that the girl should be given to the bearer of a similar token (57-58, cf. 647-51, 716-19, 1150-51). The Dionysia, which occurs tomorrow, has been fixed for the matter (58-60, 82, 373-74, 622-23).¹ The leno, however, is willing to break his promise to the Miles if Calidorus produces the money before he does (373-76). Pseudolus, Calidorus' slave and confidant (16-17), who is also without any funds (87), and who has been for some time on terms of friendship with Ballio (234), undertakes to assist Calidorus (103 ff.). His difficulties are increased by the fact that some time since he had attempted to swindle Simo, Calidorus' father, but the old man in some way became aware of the plan (406-8). Simo is aware of his son's affair (415-19, cf. 482-86), which is a matter of common gossip throughout the city (418), and he is also aware that Pseudolus is planning to cheat him (484-86).

Charimus, Calidorus' friend (694 ff.) has a slave, one that has lately come to his father from Carystus, who hasn't been outside the house, and who never visited in Athens before yesterday (729-31).

The general situation is explained in the first scene (i. 1) in which, through the device of reading aloud a letter which Calidorus has received from his sweetheart, Pseudolus, as well as the audience, is informed of Calidorus' predicament. We learn that Calidorus is in love with Phoenicium (41-44); the leno has sold her for twenty minae to a Macedonian Miles from abroad, who paid fifteen minae before his departure, leaving only five minae unpaid (51-54); on that account the Miles left a token with the arrangement that whoever should arrive with a similar token should be given the girl (55-58); the messenger is expected on the Dionysia (58-59), which is tomorrow (60); Calidorus is unable to raise any money (80). The following scene (i. 2) does not add any further information, but serves chiefly to introduce Ballio

¹ There is an inconsistency in the references to the date upon which the final payment of the Miles' is due; according to 58-60, 82, it is due tomorrow; according to 373-74, 622-23, it is due today; for a full discussion of this and other difficulties in the play see John N. Hough, The Composition of the Pseudolus of Plautus, Diss., Princeton, 1931.

and his school of meretrices, and to provide atmosphere. In the third scene (1. 3) Calidorus and Pseudolus accost Ballio, and in the course of their upbraiding additional details are revealed, particularly the fact that Calidorus had promised Ballio twenty minae for the girl, to be paid upon a certain day which is now past (279-80); furthermore, Ballio had taken an oath that he would sell the girl to no one but Calidorus (352-53); finally, Ballio is willing to break his word to the soldier if he doesn't send the money, since this is the last day (373-76); this last fact is important, as it is the condition which gets Pseudolus' activities underway. The action begins, after a short monologue by Pseudolus in which he ponders upon his course of action (1. 4), with 1. 5, in which Simo makes a sporting bet with Pseudolus.¹

¹ The repetition in 1. 3 of information already given in 1. 1, as well as the surprise manifested by Calidorus and Pseudolus when they learn in 1. 3 that Ballio has sold the girl, are taken, with other circumstances, as evidence for contamination. (For an excellent summary of the difficulties of the play, a review of previous work, and bibl., see Hough, op. cit.) According to the supporters of this theory 1. 1 and 1. 3 probably come from different originals.

Neither the repetition of information nor the "surprise" manifested in 1. 3 seem to me to be valid indications of contamination. In the first place, repetition of information, in scenes which follow one another even more closely than is the case here, is quite normal; in Epid. 1. 1, e.g., the whole situation is set forth in the conversation between Epidicus and Thesprio; in the following scene (1. 2), dialogue between Epidicus, Stratippocles and Chaeribulus, practically all the facts are repeated, and little new information is added; in the Mercator Acanthio gives a complete report (1. 2) of Demipho's activities at the harbor, while in the following scene (ii. 1) Demipho himself appears, and in a monologue repeats exactly the same story; cf. also Bac. 1. 1 with Bac. ii. 1, 2; Asin. 1. 1 with Asin. 1. 2, 3.

The primary purpose of Pseud. 1. 3 is to get the action started; Ballio must reveal that he is willing to break his word to the Miles (376), provided that he does not appear with the money (373-75); Calidorus and Pseudolus must be informed of his willingness still to sell the girl, otherwise they would have no incentive to get their plot underway. (A very similar situation is found in Phor. iii. 2. Dorio, a leno, had agreed not to sell Phaedria's sweetheart to anyone else before a certain date, which has not yet arrived (523-24); meanwhile, however, he has sold her to a Miles, who has promised the money for tomorrow; nevertheless, he is willing to break his word to the Miles if Phaedria pays

In the *Trinummus* also no one character knows all of the facts. A spendthrift youth who, in the absence of his father on

first (532-33). Here, as in the *Pseudolus*, the mention of the previous bargain is unessential, as far as the action of the play is concerned; the breaking of this bargain in each case serves to motivate the treachery to the Miles. The function of both scenes is simply to start the action.) Clearly a discussion is necessary between Calidorus, Pseudolus, and Ballio, or at least between Ballio and one or the other of his opponents. There are two obvious alternatives: (1) Calidorus and Pseudolus may immediately accuse Ballio of treachery, which would eliminate a large part of the present amusing scene, and which would show Ballio that they had inside information, the only source of which must be *Phoenicium*, thus perhaps getting her into trouble with the leno; or (2) they may pretend ignorance and lead up to the subject gradually, forcing Ballio to commit himself, the method, in my opinion, followed here.

Hough (p. 58) considers the ignorance of the sale of *Phoenicium* evidenced by Calidorus and Pseudolus in 1. 3 when informed of the bargain with the Miles, as genuine; the tone of the whole scene, however, seems to me to make it doubtful whether the astonishment and surprise displayed by the youths is actual; of course, any discussion of the sort must be purely subjective. But by a comparison of *Phor.* iii. 2 (see above), in which the astonishment is undoubtedly real, we may indicate some features of *Pseud.* 1. 3 which do not ring entirely true. In the *Phormio* Phaedria has just learned off-stage that Dorio has sold Pamphila. As they enter he is pleading with the leno for an extension of time, and tries every avenue of approach to win him over. Finally, after being reminded of his previous bargain with Phaedria, Dorio agrees to break his word to the Miles, provided Phaedria appears first with the money. In the *Pseudolus*, however, when Ballio first announces that he no longer has any *Phoenicium* to sell, Calidorus, instead of manifesting alarm, simply remarks, "non habes?" (326), and proceeds with the amusing pretense of offering sacrifice to "this supreme Jupiter" (326 ff.). He returns to the subject of his mistress (340 ff.) and elicits the story of the agreement with the Miles; then follows the repartee with Pseudolus on the subject of killing the leno (348-50); Pseudolus certainly exhibits no astonishment at Ballio's account, in contrast to Antipho and Geta in the *Phormio*, both of whom express surprise; Calidorus reminds Ballio of his oath to sell the girl to no one but himself (351-52), and, upon Ballio's confession of his treachery, Calidorus triumphantly remarks, "pejuravisti, scelesti" (354), and instructs Pseudolus to assist in hurling execrations upon Ballio (375 ff.). (The references in 1. 1 to the salutem . . . argenteam (46, 50, 80 ff.) may well apply to the previous bargain explained here.) After the departure of Ballio, Calidorus and Pseudolus, with no reference whatever to the leno's treachery, or to the knowledge gained, immediately start laying plans to get the better of him. There are three further points which, to my mind, should be emphasized as indicating pretense. The first, which is relatively unimportant, is the contrast between Calidorus' willingness, in 1. 1, to cheat his father or even his mother out of the necessary funds (120-22), and his hypocritical devotion, in 1. 3, to filial duty (288 ff.). In the second place, the reference made by Pseudolus to Calidorus' fear that Ballio might sell

a long trip, has run through his property, is faced by the problem created by a request for his sister's hand in marriage; he is unable to provide a suitable dowry and is unwilling for her to be

Phoenicium (284), and his request that Ballio wait the six days of the Dionysia (321-23), appears to me to be a clear reference to the information given by the letter in i. 1. Finally, Pseudolus' warning at the end of the first scene (125 ff.), that no one whatever should trust him today, provides a general, if not specific, preparation for pretense in i. 3.

Hough (pp. 58 ff.) examines cases of pretense in Plautus and finds that the evidence is "absolutely conclusive" that only in the clearest cases is pretense allowed without explanation; we are not warned beforehand for every pretense, not even for every one which is maintained at some length, but in such cases we invariably find that the deception is the natural complement of an earlier pretense (*Menaech.*) for which we have been amply warned, or that trickery is resorted to on the spur of the moment by a character whose every word is deceit (*Tranio*). Hough (pp. 58-59) cites *Epid.* i. 1, 2 (see above) and admits that in i. 2 Epidicus simulates amazement; he decides, however, that the "situation here is quite different; Epidicus had a real motive in pretending ignorance (101), to secure the facts from Stratippocles himself, i.e., confirm Thespricio. The matter was of grave importance to him." There is, however, considerable resemblance in the technique. In the first place, it is difficult to see why Epidicus had any more need for confirming Thespricio's report than Calidorus and Pseudolus had for confirming the report in the letter. In both the *Epidicus* and the *Pseudolus* the general outline of the scene is the same; in the *Epidicus* Stratippocles, in the *Pseudolus* Ballio, are led to admit their inconsistency, and in each case his admission is followed by rebuke. Both scenes serve to get the action underway; in both cases the pretense is obvious.

A further example of deceit without any warning to the audience (not mentioned by Hough) occurs in the *Truculentus*. In the first scene (i. 1) Diniarchus reveals the true situation, that Phronesium is pretending to be with child by a Babylonian Miles (81 ff.). In the next scene (i. 2), a conversation between Diniarchus and Astaphium, he is obviously being reensnared; Astaphium is caught in a falsehood (129 ff.) which she, however, does not admit; finally (194 ff.) Diniarchus brings up the question of Phronesium's pregnancy and the Miles; Astaphium stoutly maintains the truth of the story, and convinces Diniarchus (cf. 202-3) that he was mistaken in his belief. There is nothing whatever to indicate to the audience that she is not telling the truth, except Prol. 18-19, which scarcely enters into the discussion; even in the following scene (ii. 1), in which she announces her intention of speaking libere quae volam et quae lubebit (211), she makes no reference to the pregnancy, and the audience is not definitely sure of the facts until iv. 3. Another outstanding example occurs in the *Heauton* of Terence. At the end of iii. 3, after the exit of Clitipho (591), Chremes and Syrus discuss the matter of tricking Menodorus, which had been suggested earlier (iii. 2); Syrus admits that he has just thought of a plan (597), and proceeds to explain it; we are thus led to expect that he will take Chremes into his confidence, as he does (608 ff.); but in his preamble (598-607) he tells, without warning us that he is

married without one. The intrigue of the play consists of the efforts of the youth's temporary guardian to provide a dowry from funds left by the absent father, and at the same time to prevent the youth from learning of the funds. The details of the situation may be summarized as follows:

Charmides, a man of high rank (cf. 324-25, 373), a widower (111), after seeing his large (cf. 682) possessions squandered away by his son (108-9, cf. 12-13, 325-28, 682, etc.), went to Seleucia (112, 771, 845, 901) to retrieve his fortune (cf. 838-39). He left his profligate son, his grown daughter (cf. 374), and all his property in charge of his friend (cf. 106) Callicles (112-14, cf. 876-77). Before he left he showed Callicles, in a certain room of the house (150-51, cf. 753-55, 783-86), a treasure (150, 175, 732-33, 750 ff., etc.) of three thousand nummi Phillipei (152), and begged Callicles to promise on his honor not to reveal it to his son (153-54); if Charmides returns he intends to give it back to him (156); if not, he has a marriage-portion for the daughter (157-59, cf. 732-33). About fifteen days ago (402), however, while Callicles was in the country for only six days (166), the son, without Callicles' knowledge (167), advertised the house for sale (168). Rather than reveal the treasure to the son, or let another have the house (173-78), Callicles bought it himself on Charmides' behalf (179-80), with his own (Callicles') money (180-82), at a cost of forty minae (125-26, cf. 403, 420, 1082), and moved in (125, cf. 1080-84). The son is living in the posticum, which he retained when he sold the house (193-94, cf. 1085). The daughter is living with Callicles (196-97); Lysiteles, son of Philto (276), of a wealthy family (605, 1132-35), a friend of Lesbonicus' (cf. 326, 359-60), is desirous of marrying the girl without a dowry (374-75), ostensibly, at least, in order to relieve Lesbonicus' poverty (326 ff.). Callicles is generally accused of despoiling Lesbonicus of his property (212-14).

The money which Lesbonicus received for the house has all been spent on food and mistresses (402-13), or paid to the banker (425-26a), where Lesbonicus had gone surety for a friend (427-28). The only property remaining to him is a piece of land near the city (508-10, 512-13, 520 ff., 616, 652, 683, 695, 700), the sole support of himself and his slave, Stasimus (512-13, cf. 561).

As the prologue suggests,¹ the general presuppositions

planning to deceive Chremes also, an entirely false story; the only way in which the audience can recognize it as false is by remembering the true situation as set forth earlier (ii. 3); the truth again appears in the following scene (iv. 1).

¹16-17: sed de argumento ne expectetis fabulae:
senes qui huc venient, i rem vobis aperient.

are given in the dialogue between Megaronides and Callicles (i. 2) in which the latter is led to give a full account of the situation to refute Megaronides' charge of misconduct. We learn of Callicles' appointment as guardian of Lesbonicus and his sister upon Charmides' going abroad, and of the treasure concealed in the house. Two essential facts do not appear, however, until the second scene following (ii. 2); they are (a) that Lesbonicus is in need (330 ff.), and (b) that Lysiteles is anxious to marry Lesbonicus' sister without a dowry (374-75). Lysiteles enters (ii. 1) with a long self-characterizing monologue;¹ his father appears (ii. 2), and after some preliminary conversation (276-323) Lysiteles reveals his reason for seeking an interview with his father (cf. 324); his friend Lesbonicus has lost his property and is suffering from poverty (326 ff.), an essential condition of the plot, as it provides the reason for Lesbonicus' opposition to his sister's marriage;² Lysiteles' request for his father's permission to arrange a dowerless proposal of marriage gives us the second important fact. Lysiteles also begs his father to broach the matter to Lesbonicus (385-86); as it is this request which initiates the action of the play we may therefore say that the action begins at this point (385).³

In the Bacchides a divided exposition results from the

¹This monologue bears considerable resemblance in position, purpose, and content, to that of Philolaches (Most. i. 2); cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 201, and below, p. 97.

²Any bewilderment which the spectator may feel because of the apparent contradiction between Lesbonicus' recently receiving forty minae from the sale of the house (cf. 116-26), and his straits as depicted in Lysiteles' account here, is removed by the conversation between Lesbonicus and Stasimus (ii. 4), in which we learn that the forty minae have already been dissipated (402 ff.).

³On the resemblances between the Trinummus and the Mostellaria, see below, pp. 97 ff.

use of the device of a returning traveller, who imparts some essential information. In this play two youths are in love with two sisters, meretrices. The action of the play consists principally of efforts to trick the father of one of the youths out of sufficient money to finance his son's love-affair. The facts may be summarized as follows:

Mnesilochus, who, together with his slave, Chrysalus (170 ff.), had been sent by his father on a business trip (249) to Ephesus (171, 231, 236, 249, etc.), has received on demand (686) twelve hundred Philippi (230-31, 272) from Archidemides (250, 686), an hospes of his father's (230-31, 250, 686); he has returned after an absence of two years (170, 388, cf. 237-38). While in Ephesus he became involved in a love-affair (177, 192, cf. 206-7) with a meretrix (39, cf. 1096) from Samos (200, 574) named Bacchis (200, cf. 39, 53). She is in the service of a Miles, who hired her for a year (1096-97, cf. frag. xvii); he has brought her to Athens today (94, 101, 107), where she is visiting her sister (36 [scoror], 39, 108), who is also named Bacchis (39, cf. 53); he is willing to release her upon the payment of two hundred Philippi (590, 706, 868, cf. 42-46, 104, 220-23, 1098), the money due for the balance of the year (1098); if this is not forthcoming, he will take her along with him (42-43, 45-46, 103-4, 590-91) today (591, cf. 47, 221-22) to Elatea (591). Mnesilochus, before he left Ephesus (389, 561), sent a letter (176-77, 389-90, 561) by a messenger (197) to his chum (60, 175, 389, 460), Pistoclerus, asking him to find his mistress for him (389-90, 562, cf. 177, 200); Pistoclerus has carried out the commission (60, 196-200, cf. 1. 1 passim; cf. also frag. xii).

The beginning of the Bacchides is fragmentary, and any reconstruction of the opening scene or scenes must remain highly conjectural.¹ The material which one should judge was contained in the lost section has been summarized briefly by A. Freté.² She concludes that it is necessary that the spectator should know (1) how the Samian Bacchis arrived in Athens, and (2) how she knew Mnesilochus, some information about their love, and their intentions; it is necessary besides that the situation of the

¹For the latest attempt to arrange the fragments, and for bibliography, see H. H. Law, "The Metrical Arrangement of the Fragments of the Bacchides," C. P., XXIV (1929), 197-201.

²Andrée Freté, Essai sur la structure dramatique des comédies de Plaute (Paris, 1930), p. 26.

Miles, and of the Athenian Bacchis, should be explained clearly; Pistoclerus also should be presented in some manner.

Miss Law, in reviewing the generally accepted reconstruction, posits three scenes: in the first Bacchis appears with a monologue, in which, after giving her slaves directions about the house (frags. 3, 4), she mentions that she has seen a youth haunting the neighborhood, and wonders who he is (frags. 15, 16). Then Pistoclerus enters with a monody telling of his search (frag. 17), Bacchis hears her sister's name (frag. 6), and they address each other. In the next scene the slave comes from the harbor with the conventional monody of the good and bad slave (frags. 1, 2), tells of seeing the sister whom he recognized by her resemblance to the Athenian Bacchis (frag. 5), and describes the soldier who was with her in answer to the questions of Pistoclerus and Bacchis (frags. 7, 8, 9). Then the Samian Bacchis enters, accompanied by a puer (cf. 577), the sisters greet each other affectionately (frags. 12, 13), and the Athenian Bacchis questions her sister (frag. 14). The other fragments, in Miss Law's view, probably indicate a letter which the Samian Bacchis reads, explaining the situation in which she finds herself.

Whatever the reconstruction of the beginning of the play may be, all the facts necessary to the understanding of the play may be gathered from the early scenes of the play as it stands. We are handicapped, however, in determining where the action begins. It may perhaps be considered to begin with the present opening scene (i. 1), for in it Pistoclerus is ensnared by the Bacchides for their own purposes. The intrigue proper, however, does not get underway until the appearance of Nicobulus (ii. 3), the father of Mnesilochus; in this scene Chrysalus makes a start upon his plan for tricking Nicobulus out of sufficient money to

rescue Mnesilochus' sweetheart from the Miles.

The play, as it now stands, opens with a dialogue scene (i. 1) between the Bacchides and Pistoclerus. We gather that the Samian Bacchis is in need of money to obtain her release from a Miles (42-46, 103-4); if Pistoclerus should help them find the money he would be helping along his chum at the same time (60); the Samian Bacchis has just arrived by sea (94, 101, 106-7); the Miles is expected soon (47). Pistoclerus is sent to purchase food for a dinner, and returns (i. 2) followed by his paedagogus, Lydus. The scene does nothing more than provide amusement and atmosphere; Pistoclerus glories in his newly discovered emancipation. In the following scene (ii. 1) Chrysalus, the slave of Pistoclerus' friend, Mnesilochus, appears from the harbor. We learn that he and his master have just returned from a two-year trip to Ephesus (170-71); Chrysalus is anxious to avoid Nicobulus until he has seen Pistoclerus, to whom Mnesilochus had sent a letter about his mistress, Bacchis (174-77). Pistoclerus enters, and exchanges information with Chrysalus; the only new information, disregarding the facts which have already been presented to the audience, is that Chrysalus has brought back twelve hundred aurei which his master had collected in Ephesus, money a friend there owed Nicobulus (230-31).

The essential information is now complete; the only further facts added in the course of the play are a matter of unimportant realistic details. Though it is impossible to be dogmatic about the point at which the action begins, we may say, at least, that the situation is given in detail before the intrigue gets underway (ii. 3); granting that this marks the beginning of the action, the preceding exposition consists of several scenes, some of which are partly (i. 1), or wholly (i. 2), devoted to atmos-

phere; through the use of the device of the returning traveller (ii. 1, 2) there is a spread in the exposition.

In the Mostellaria the extensive exposition must be attributed to an interest in characterization and the portrayal of atmosphere; there is no limitation placed upon the poet's choice of expository characters by the fact that knowledge of the circumstances is confined to any one person, or that no one person knows all the facts; they are a matter of general knowledge. The action revolves about the efforts of Tranio to prevent his master, Theopropides, who has returned unexpectedly from abroad, from entering his house where his son, Philolaches, and others, who are caught in the midst of a riotous celebration, are concealed. Tranio succeeds in convincing his master that the house is haunted, but his efforts are foiled by the arrival of a slave who is calling for Callidamates, Philolaches' chum, and who reveals the true situation to Theopropides. The expository facts may be summarized somewhat as follows:

During the three year (78-79, 440) absence of his father (25, 78-79, 431-32, etc.), Theopropides, on a trading trip (971) to Egypt (440, 994), Philolaches, under the efficient guidance of Tranio (21 ff., 983-84), has been leading a life of dissipation (11-12, 20 ff., 144-45, 235-36, etc.), in the course of which he has been having a love-affair (142, 162-63, 167, 182, 188-89, 305, etc.) with a meretrix (190), Philematium, a tibicina (971); she, although there are other men who love her (231), is keeping herself for Philolaches alone (190, cf. 216-17); Philolaches has set her free (204, cf. 23, 537-38, etc.) with money borrowed from Misargyrides, a danista (537-38, etc.), at a cost of thirty minae (300, 973); he now owes forty minae principal (627), and four minae interest (630, etc.); nothing has been paid on either (561).

The four introductory scenes of this play constitute a very elaborate exposition. At the same time the facts to be presented are relatively few. The play opens (i. 1) with a quarrel between Grumio (protatic) and Tranio, slaves of the household. We learn that their master has been abroad three years (25, 78-79),

and that in his absence, under Tranio's leadership (20 ff.), he is being eaten out of house and home (11-12), while his son is being demoralized (21, 29 ff.). The second scene (1. 2) consists of a monologue by Philolaches, which serves almost entirely for characterization. The only information which it contains is that he is in love (142), that his money, credit, and reputation are all gone (144-45), and that he is, temporarily at least, repentant (149 ff.). His sweetheart, Philematium, and Scapha enter to complete Philematium's toilet, and Philolaches, unobserved, stands aside to watch the process. The scene serves largely to characterize Philematium, but some further information is presented: Philolaches has set her free with his own money (204), which, as Philolaches remarks in an aside, has ruined him (206); the price was thirty minae (300).¹ Callidamates and Delphium, friends of Philolaches and Philematium, arrive (11. 1) and a drinking party gets underway. This scene contains no expository information, but serves solely for the depiction of atmosphere. The action begins with the following scene (11. 2); Tranio appears from the harbor in great consternation with the report that his master has unexpectedly arrived from abroad.

The plays thus far discussed have one distinguishing feature in common; this is that the exposition, as regards essential facts, is complete before the beginning of the action, and the audience is aware of all the factors involved. The technique of the Amphitruo, which we shall take up next, differs only in that

¹We do not learn that the money for the purchase of Philematium and for financing the life of dissipation is borrowed until the appearance of Misargyrides (111. 1). There Tranio, upon catching sight of him, reveals, in his alarm, that he has been the source of their funds (537-38). Later (630), we learn that the loan, interest and principal, amounts to forty-four minae. Information is introduced in a somewhat similar fashion in the Persa; see p. 4, n. 1.

certain essential features of the situation are not revealed until shortly after the action has begun. This information has no bearing upon the preceding action. The chief interest of the play is found in the confusion of Jupiter and Amphitruo, and of their respective attendants, Mercury and Sosia; the confusion is intensified by the ability of the god to divine the story of the mortal husband and to perform miracles of theft without breaking seals. At the end of the play Jupiter reveals the truth in propria persona, and Alcmena and Amphitruo are reconciled. The facts may be summarized as follows:

In the city of Thebes (97, 190, 195, 259, etc.) dwells Amphitruo (97-98, passim), born in Argos, of an Argive father (98), and his wife, Alcmena (99, passim), Electrus' daughter (99). Amphitruo, accompanied by his slave, Sosia (120-25, cf. 161-62), has been in command of the Theban army (100, cf. 192) in the war between the Thebans and the Teleboians (101, 205 ff.). He has returned victorious (136 ff., 188 ff.), laden with spoils (138, cf. 193), including a golden bowl from which King Pterelas used to drink (260-61, 419, 534-35, etc.), enclosed in a chest (420, 773, 783 ff.) sealed with Amphitruo's signet (421, 773-74, 784, 787). This bowl, without Amphitruo's knowledge (cf. 762 ff.), has been stolen by Mercury and Jupiter (138-39, cf. 534-35, 759 ff.). Amphitruo, who has been gone about ten months (cf. 670),¹ has not been home since he joined his troops (734-35, 759); he left Port Persicus last evening (403, 412, 823) and arrived at Thebes during the night (731-32, cf. 163-64); he has been spending the remainder of the night on board ship (731-32).

Alcmena, who was with child by her husband before his departure to his troops (102-3, cf. 483, 668), caught Jupiter's fancy (107, 289-90, 480 ff.) without her husband's knowledge (107, passim, cf. especially 1122); Jupiter, in the guise of Amphitruo, enjoyed her and got her with child (108-9, cf. 480-85, 1122-24, 1135-38), with the result that Alcmena is with child by both (110-11, 481 ff., 878-879, 1122-24, 1135-38); one is a ten months child (481, 670), one a seven months child (482); her time is near (500, cf. 481, 670, 1039).

At the opening of the play, then, shortly before dawn (533, 737), Jupiter, in the guise of Amphitruo (115, 121-22,

¹Sosia's estimate (670) would naturally be based upon the length of time they were gone. The outside limits of the length of their absence are ten months and seven months (cf. 102-3, 481-85).

134-35, cf. 497-98, etc.), is within, embracing Alcmena (112, 120, 131-32, 289-90, 499 ff.), and for this reason the present night has been prolonged (113, 272-76, 279, 546). He came at midnight (514), was welcomed by Alcmena as her husband (713-15, 800), bathed (802), had dinner with her (735, 802-5), went to bed with her (735, 807-8), and is telling her the events of the campaign (133-37, 744-45, cf. 534-36). Mercury is impersonating Sosia (116-17, 124, 141, cf. 265, 747).

The prologue of the Amphitruo gives a full account of the presuppositions and of the situation when the play opens. All essential facts are repeated in the play proper, with a few minor exceptions; these exceptions consist of some slight biographical details (the fact that Amphitruo was born in Argos of an Argive father (98), and that Alcmena is Electrus' daughter (99)) with which the audience would presumably be familiar from their knowledge of the myth, and of the reference to the distinguishing details of dress (142-47), which is rendered relatively unessential by the care taken to identify the characters upon their appearance (cf. 497-98, 861-64, 976, etc.). The prologue is spoken by Mercury, who remains on the stage for the following scene, as does Charinus in the Mercator, and Palaestrio in the Miles.

The Amphitruo begins (i. 1) with a monologue by Sosia, who enters on his way home to apprise Alcmena of her husband's return. He does not see Mercury until vs. 292. In the course of his soliloquy he decides to rehearse the account he intends to give Alcmena, and the resulting narrative presents an elaborate account of the campaign which Amphitruo has recently completed; the greater part of this description is unessential. From Sosia's monologue, before the dialogue with Mercury begins, we gather part of the situation: Sosia and his master have just returned, and Sosia has been sent ahead from the harbor, although it is still night (161-64); Amphitruo has conducted a victorious campaign (188 ff.); he was presented with a golden bowl from which King

Pterelas was wont to drink (260-61); it is an unusually long night (272-76, 279). Through asides by Mercury we are informed that Mercury has taken on the appearance of Sosia (265-67), and that his father is in Alcmena's embrace (289-90). The action begins with Sosia's discovery of Mercury (292); Mercury proceeds to convince Sosia that he is not Sosia; the only further expository details that appear are that Amphitrucio has just arrived from Port Persicus (403), and that the bowl with which Amphitrucio was presented is in a little chest sealed with Amphitrucio's ring (420-21).

In the following scene (1. 2) Mercury indulges in a soliloquy in which he reveals some further essential information, and announces the course which the action will follow, as well as the outcome of the play--he will continue to muddle up Sosia and Amphitrucio until his father has his fill of love; finally Jupiter will renew the former harmony between Alcmena and her spouse (470-75); Alcmena now is about to bring forth two sons, the one a ten months boy, the other a seven; Amphitrucio is the father of the older child, Jupiter of the younger (479-85).

By way of summary, then, we may say that the essential exposition, with the exception of the fact that Alcmena is pregnant by both Jupiter and Amphitrucio (which is revealed in the prologue, 102 ff.), is complete before the action begins; this latter condition is presented before it plays any part in the action, so that the delay in its revelation produces no suspense.

The technique employed in the Stichus is, in general, very similar to that used in the plays previously discussed; the situation is clear in its chief essentials before the beginning of the action; the difference lies in the necessity placed upon the audience of piecing together one phase of the presuppositions from scattered references. The plot is extremely slight, with

the element of intrigue entirely lacking. The play falls naturally into three sections. The first division (1-401) consists of the exposition (1. 1, 2, 3) which depicts the situation of the two faithful wives, Panegyris and Pamphila, whose husbands have been abroad for a considerable time upon a trading trip; it also reports the return of the husbands after a successful venture. The second division (402-640) depicts the return of the husbands, Epignomus and Pamphilippus, their reconciliation with their father-in-law, and the frustration of the efforts of their parasite, Gelasimus, to obtain an invitation to dinner. The third section (641-775) consists of a banquet at which Stichus and Sangarinus, slaves who had accompanied the brothers on their voyage, entertain their mistress, Stephanium, by way of celebration of their return. These three divisions are very loosely connected.¹ The facts are as follows:

Pamphila and her older sister, Panegyris (2, 9, 41), daughters of Antipho, are married to two brothers (cf. 415, 540), Pamphilippus and Epignomus. The two families are next door neighbors, with their houses connected by a passage through the garden (449-52, 614, 623). They were formerly in prosperous circumstances (cf. 132-34), but due largely to the brothers' riotous living under the leadership of their parasite, Gelasimus (214, 267, 272-73, 372, 462, 584, 628),² they have lost their property (132-34); as a result Gelasimus has fallen from favor (cf. 212-16, 267-68, 465 ff., etc.); he has not been summoned to the brothers' houses during the three years of their absence (166-68); enmity also sprang up between Antipho and his sons-in-law (408 ff., cf. 132-34). The brothers left on a trading trip to Asia (152, 367, 404-5); they have been absent three years (29-30, 137, cf. 166-68, 214); during this period their anxious (cf. 5-6, 284, 303) wives have heard nothing from them (31-32); they have been keeping a servant on watch at the harbor for days (153); on the day on which the play opens Pinacium had been sent to the harbor at daybreak (364). Antipho, acting at least partially on the advice of his friends (128, cf. 143), is desirous of separating his daughters from their husbands (14-17),

¹Cf. Leo, "Über den Stichus des Plautus," Näch. Gött. Gesell., Phil.-hist. Kl. (1902), pp. 375 ff.

²Cf. Prescott, "The Interpretation of Roman Comedy," Class. Phil., XI (1916), p. 137.

and of having them return home (128), with a view to other matches (cf. 80, 14); the girls, however, who are aware of his intention (cf. 56), and who do not regret having married the men they did (133 ff.), consider it their duty to remain faithful to their husbands (34 ff., 129 ff.). Antipho, while wishing his daughters to return home, is resolved to yield to them rather than to stir up too much unpleasantness (81-83). Meanwhile the brothers have had a successful expedition (366-71, 402-5, 507), and are returning home, with Epignomus, accompanied by his slave, Stichus, slightly in advance of Pamphilippus (390-91, 417), though they had spent the night in the same harbor (416).

The general situation is set forth in the opening scene (1. 1) in the conversation between the sisters. We learn that their husbands have been absent for three years (3a-4, 29-30), and that their father is desirous of arranging a separation (14-17), a prospect which they find distasteful.¹ In the second scene (1. 2) their father, Antipho, appears and the situation is elaborated further. In particular we learn something of Antipho's side of the controversy--he is acting upon the advice of his friends (128), and is not as set in his purpose as his daughters apparently imagine (81-82). One further fact appears, the fact that they have lost their riches (132-34); this implies, at least, the reason for the voyage which the girls' husbands undertook.²

Thus, with the exception of the relation of Gelasimus to the principals, and the reason for the loss of riches which forced the brothers into their expedition, the exposition is complete before the action begins (11. 1) with Pinacium's return from the harbor. Gelasimus is introduced (1. 3) with a typical parasite-monologue which provides little information; we learn merely that he has been having a hard time of it for the last three years, and has nearly reached the point of starvation (212 ff.); the mention of triennium (214), corresponding to the period during which

¹See p. 117, n. 1.

²On this scene as illustrative, see p. 134, n. 1.

the brothers have been abroad (cf. 29-30, 137), would suggest a connection between the absence of his patrons and his own plight. The fact that he has never had a summons from Panegyris since her husband left (267-68), and his surprise at his summons (266 ff.), indicate that he had lost the popularity he once enjoyed (cf. 212 ff.; 272-73 where, upon catching sight of Pinacium, he comments upon how often Pinacium had poured out the wine for him); this loss of popularity is emphasized by Pinacium's snub when Gelasimus addresses him (cf. 319-22). Gelasimus' extravagant delight at the return of Epignomus (cf. 372, 462, 584) illustrates the situation as suggested before--that his plight has been due to the absence of the brothers. Finally, when Epignomus is driven to desperation by Gelasimus' persistence, a last important fact is revealed (628): dum parasitus mihi atque fratri fuisti, rem confregimus; here at last the reason for the brothers' loss of their property is suggested; taken in connection with Gelasimus' previous remarks (212 ff., 272-73) it is evident from this that the parasite had been a leader in riotous living, and that this extravagance had necessitated the brothers' attempt to recoup their fortunes.¹

¹Fraenkel, *Plaut. im Plautus*, pp. 279 ff., finds difficulty in the lack of a full explanation in the preliminary exposition of the enmity existing between Antipho and his sons-in-law. "So wie sich jetzt der Eingang des Dramas vor uns entwickelt, erscheint das Drängen des Antipho auf eine Lösung des Ehebundes seiner Töchter als eine unverständliche Bosheit oder eine Schrulle; die Tatsache dass die Männer jetzt verarmt sind, reicht zum Verständnis nicht aus. Erst viel später (V. 408) erfährt man, dass ein schwerer Konflikt zwischen dem Alten und seinen Schwiegersöhnen bestanden hat, noch viel später und ganz beiläufig (V. 628) wird die Ursache dieses Konflikts klar: die jungen Männer haben in leichtsinnigem Lebenswandel ihre gesamte Habe durchgebracht; damals waren sie schon vermählt, denn als sie heirateten, waren sie begütert (134). Der Schwiegervater hat also einen recht guten Grund für seine Animosität, aber auch dass Misstrauen der einen Schwester (V. 31 sqq.) empfängt von dieser Vorgeschichte her eine andere Beleuchtung" (p. 279). Fraenkel also considers that the reason for the brothers' voyage, and a fuller account of their previous

The expository technique of the Stichus represents, to a certain extent at least, a compromise between the simple type of exposition found in plays in which all necessary information is given before the action begins, and the more complicated technique to be discussed next in which there is a gradual accumulation of expository facts; the difference is mainly one of degree.

In the remaining plays the exposition is, to a greater or less degree, gradual; that is, the audience is not put in possession of all the facts and conditions involved before the action begins; important facts are withheld until they are necessary for the further development of the action, or until they are dramatically effective. The majority of the plays in this group are plays containing recognitions;¹ in most of these the facts reserved are those primarily affecting the recognition, and, as a general rule,

history, should appear in the early exposition. He concludes, then (p. 280), that Plautus in the first and second scenes has departed widely from his original.

In my opinion Fraenkel is overemphasizing the difficulty, as well as overlooking the significance of vss. 132 ff. In 408 ff. Epignomus simply relates that he has become reconciled with Antipho, due to the fact that he has returned with great riches. Thus, obviously, the reason for Antipho's dislike of his daughters' marriages was a financial one. But this fact has already been revealed in the second scene; Antipho asks (132), vosne ego patiar cum mendicis nuptas me vivo viris? which certainly shows that his objection is to the poverty-stricken condition of the husbands, as does his further question in 135--vosne latrones et mendicos homines magni penditis? And, as Fraenkel notices, Pamphila's reply (134) idem animus in paupertate qui olim in divitiis fuit shows that they formerly were well off; it is not a difficult deduction that Antipho's enmity is due to the change from riches to poverty. Thus the situation is explained even more clearly here than it is in 408 ff. The reason for the loss of their property does not definitely appear until 626, as Fraenkel observes; this, however, causes no great difficulty; as we shall see below in the discussion of plays having what we term "gradual exposition," the withholding of presuppositions until late in the play is not an unusual occurrence.

¹For the sake of convenience we shall use the term "recognition" in its conventional sense of the discovery of the true identity of persons, rather than in its broader technical meaning of the change from ignorance to knowledge. Cf. Prescott, "The Comedy of Errors," Class. Phil., XXIV (1929), pp. 32 ff.

they are not revealed before the discovery itself; in other cases, however, the facts are distributed over a larger part of the play.

While the Casina is technically a recognition play, the recognition has no connection with the action whatever. The play represents a father and son as rivals for the favors of a slave-girl in the family. Each plans to marry her to a personal slave; this arrangement would then give the slave-husband's owner special claims upon her. As the son has been sent abroad by his father, his mother looks after his interests. The girl falls to the father's slave in an appeal to the lots, and preparations are made for the marriage; the bride, much to the surprise of the expectant groom and his equally expectant backer, proves to be the son's slave in disguise. The facts may be summarized as follows:

Lysidamus, an old man of Athens, who is not on particularly good terms with his wife, Cleostrata (172-75, 189-90, 227), has fallen in love with a slave-girl (cf. 108--conserva) of the family (47-49, 150, 196, 225, etc.). This girl, Casina, was noticed by a slave of Lysidamus' as she was being exposed, sixteen years ago; the slave prevailed upon the woman who was abandoning the child to let him have her, and took her home to his mistress, begging her to rear the child (37-44). She did so, at her own expense (194), nearly as if she were her own daughter (45-46, 193-94). The girl is both chaste and freeborn (81-82), and ultimately proves to be the daughter of Alcesimus (1013), a friend of Lysidamus' (cf. 477).

Euthynicus (1014), the only (263) son of Lysidamus and Cleostrata, has also fallen in love with Casina (50, 60-61, cf. 262-63--quia enim filio nos oportet opitulari unico). So both father and son are laying their plans, each without the knowledge of the other (50-51). Lysidamus has commissioned his villicus (98) to ask the girl in marriage (52-53, 193-95, 254, 288, 992-94, cf. 94-96), hoping for clandestine (cf. 451) excubias foris (53-54; cf. 193-94, 339, 451, 672, 701-2, 839, 992-94); his son is backing the suit of his armigerus (257, 55-56, 289, cf. 102, 151-54, 329), also with the hope of sharing the maid's affections (56-57). Lysidamus, upon learning that his son is his rival, has sent him abroad (60-62); but the son has the support of his mother (59, 63, 151-54, 262-63, 289), who has discovered her husband's affair (58, 196).

The Casina has a prologue giving a full account of the presuppositions and the situation at the opening of the play. As

we have mentioned above, the recognition in the Casina is entirely unrelated to the action, so that the detailed account in the prologue of the previous history of Casina (37-46) is entirely unessential; the prologue also announces that Casina will prove to be freeborn, the daughter of an Athenian citizen (79-83). The recognition in the play proper consists merely of an announcement to the audience at the very end of the play (1012 ff.) that Casina will prove to be the daughter of their next-door neighbor, and that she will marry Euthynicus. All the information given in the prologue regarding the situation as the play opens (47-67) is repeated later, with the exception of the fact that the son has been sent abroad by his father (60-62), which accounts for his non-appearance in the play.

The play begins (i. 1) with a quarrel between the two slaves, Olympio and Chalinus. The only information conveyed by the scene is that each intends to make their conserva, Casina, his wife; Olympio intends to marry her (94-96); Chalinus claims that she is promised to him (102). In the following scene (ii. 1) Cleostrata, the wife of Lysidamus, enters and in a monody relates that her husband is opposing both her and her son to satisfy his amorous instincts (150); we learn to what she is referring in the next scene (ii. 2), a dialogue between Cleostrata and her neighbor, Myrrhina--Cleostrata has a little maid of her own, and her husband is trying, against Cleostrata's will, to marry the girl to his villicus when, as a matter of fact, he is in love with her himself (193-95a).¹ Lysidamus enters (ii. 3) with a self-satis-

¹Fraenkel, Plaut. im Plautus, pp. 294 ff., argues at length that in the original of Diphilos Cleostrata, before the beginning of the play, had no inkling of her husband's love for Casina, and considers that the passages in the play depicting her as aware of the situation are Plautine additions; this view is vigorously opposed by Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches (Berlin, 1931), pp. 105 ff.

fied soliloquy on the power of love, in the course of which he definitely states that he is in love with Casina (225). The action of the play begins in this scene with the dialogue between husband and wife (229).

The necessary exposition is not complete at the point at which the action begins. Summarizing what we have gathered thus far we find (a) that Olympio intends to marry Casina, (b) that Chalinus considers her as promised to him, (c) that Lysidamus is in love with Casina, and that his wife knows he is, (d) that Lysidamus is trying to marry Casina to Olympio, and (e) that in doing so he is opposing both his wife and his son. The two important facts that we do not yet know are that Cleostrata and her son have promised Chalinus that he is to have Casina as his bride, and that Lysidamus is to share the bridegroom's privileges if Olympio is successful. The first of these facts appears shortly after the beginning of the action; in the course of the argument between husband and wife as to the proper husband for Casina (ii. 3), it appears that Cleostrata is backing Chalinus (257-58, 262), on behalf of their son (262-63). This information is emphasized in the following scene (ii. 4) in which, in the course of Lysidamus' efforts to persuade Chalinus to give up his claims, we learn that Lysidamus has definitely promised Casina to Olympio (288), while Cleostrata and her son have definitely promised her to Chalinus (289). The second important fact mentioned above is revealed in the next scene (ii. 5) in which Lysidamus and Olympio hold a conference. There we are informed explicitly that Lysidamus is to share the perquisites if Olympio marries Casina (339).

The expository information is now complete. The technique employed may be summarized as follows: the expository section of the play is spread over several scenes, which contribute to the

depiction of character and atmosphere; in the course of these scenes expository information is given gradually, in a most artistic fashion, with the final picture resulting from the accumulation of details; the information is not entirely complete at the point at which the action begins.

The same type of technique is to be observed in the Aulularia; here, however, there is less information to be presented at the opening of the play, and important facts are reserved until quite late. The interest of the play centers primarily about the miserly Euclio, and his fear of losing a pot of gold which he has recently discovered; the plot serves principally to display his character. Megadorus, an elderly bachelor, seeks to marry Euclio's daughter, ignorant of the fact that she has been ravished by his nephew and is with child by him. The end of the play is lost, but according to the prologue the nephew marries the girl. The facts, in brief, are as follows:

Euclio, who has discovered a hoard of gold (26, 63, 65, 110, passim), buried by his grandfather (6, 8), has one grown (191) daughter (23, passim), for whom he has been having difficulty in finding a husband (191); she, without his knowledge (30, 277, 796, cf. also 74-76), has been ravished by a youth of high rank (28, 74-76, 275-76), Lyconides, the son of Antimachus and Eunomia, nephew of Megadorus (778-79), by night, at the festival of Ceres (36, 792-95), ten months ago (797). The crime was committed under the influence of drink (689); the youth now is in love with the girl (603), and desires to marry her (793). Her time is near (74-76, 275-77, 691 ff.). The youth knows the identity of his victim (29, 603, 689), but she does not know who he is (30).

The Aulularia has a prologue which gives an account of the presuppositions and the present situation; all essential facts are repeated later. In only one respect does the prologue give fuller information than the play proper: we learn the previous history of the pot of gold (3-27); this account, which is unessential as far as the action of the play is concerned, serves prin-

cipally as a means of characterizing Euclio.¹

The play proper begins with a dialogue scene between Euclio and Staphyla (i. 1) in which two essential facts are presented. In an aside (63, 65) Euclio reveals that he has gold hidden inside the house (cf. Prol. 25-27); in a monologue which covers a brief interval during which Euclio hurriedly dashes into the house to assure himself that his gold is safe, Staphyla worries over the problem of concealing her young mistress' condition --she is in disgrace, and her time is near (74-76; cf. Prol. 28). It is an easy deduction, therefore, that thus far her condition has escaped notice; this fact is definitely emphasized some little time later (cf. 275-77). In an exit monologue at the end of the second scene (i. 2) Euclio refers once more to his gold in the house (110).

This is the total amount of information given in the preliminary exposition. The action begins with the following scene (ii. 1) in which Eunomia and Megadorus are introduced (cf. Prol. 31-36), and the latter yields to the persuasion of his sister and agrees to marry; he decides to ask for the hand of Euclio's daughter. The action which follows, up to the beginning of Act iv, is concerned with the preparations for the wedding, and Euclio's persecution-fixation in the matter of the treasure. Finally (iv. 1), the servant of Lyconides appears and we get the first intimation that Megadorus has a rival for the girl, though we do not learn who the rival is; the slave simply announces that his master is in love with Euclio's daughter (603), that he has just heard that she is to be married (604), and that he has sent him over to keep

¹One other fact is mentioned in the prologue which is not repeated later. This is that Euclio's daughter does not know the identity of her ravisher (30); this phase of the situation, however, was probably cleared up in the lost portion of the play.

an eye on things and report. He happens to overhear Euclio muttering about his gold and the shrine of Fides, and for several scenes (iv. 2-6) the action consists of the slave's efforts to find the gold, and Euclio's attempts to thwart him.

At last Lyconides himself appears (iv. 7) and we learn from his conversation with his mother that he is the lover of Euclio's daughter--that he had wronged her while he was intoxicated (cf. Prol. 28-30, 34-36). This completes the revelation of the presuppositions, though some further realistic details are added during Lyconides' confession to Euclio (iv. 10).

In the following group of recognition plays there is one feature in common; this is that the giving of the expository information necessary for the understanding of the action preceding the denouement is completed before the action begins; the exposition is gradual in so far as certain facts, affecting the recognition, are reserved until the recognition occurs, or until very shortly before.

The Menaechmi is a comedy of errors involving twin brothers of identical appearance who were separated in childhood; one was kidnapped; the other, after the loss of his brother, was given his brother's name. Years later the one twin, in the course of a search for his kidnapped brother, arrives in Epidamnus, where his brother is living; the action of the play consists of an amusing series of mistaken identities which continue until finally the brothers are brought face to face and a recognition takes place. The facts, as they can be gathered from the play, are as follows:

Moschus (407, 1078, 1098, 1108), a merchant of Syracuse (17, 407-8, 1069, 1109, 1112), and his wife, Teuximarcha (1131), had twin sons (18, 232, 1082, 1117-20), Menaechmus and Sosicles (37-40, 42-43, 48, etc.; 1122-23, 1126-29), of identical appearance (19-21, 1062-63, 1088-90). When the boys were seven years old (24, 1116) their father loaded a ship with merchandise (25), and took one twin, Menaechmus, with him to Tarentum, his place of trade (26-27,

1112), leaving the other at home with his mother (28); they arrived at Tarentum during a festival (29); the boy strayed from his father in the crowd (30-31, 1113), and never saw his father again (1117); a merchant from Epidamnus (32) picked up the boy (33, 1113), and took him off to Epidamnus (33). The father died of grief at Tarentum a few days later (34-36, 1127); when the news reached the boys' grandfather at Syracuse he changed the name of the other twin (37-40, 1127-28), because of his affection for the stolen boy (41), to Menaechmus (42-43, 1127-28), the grandfather's own name (44), so that now both are known by the same name (48, 1068, 1077, 1095-96, 1107-8, *passim*). Since the Epidamnian kidnapper was childless, he adopted the boy, gave him a wife with a dowry (cf. 766-67), and made him his heir (57-62), leaving him a large fortune (67, cf. 98 ff., 120 ff.) upon his death by drowning while attempting to ford a stream swollen by a recent rain (63-66).

This stolen twin, who still lives in Epidamnus (68, 72, 230), is not on particularly good terms with his wife (cf. 110 ff., 151); he, unknown to this wife (152), has been having an affair with Erotium, a meretrix (123-24, 130, 152, 172-74, 300, 358 ff.), who finds him very useful (358); he has, in the past, presented her with gifts filched from his wife (cf. 531-32), and just before his appearance in the play he has stolen a *palla* (130, 165 ff., 199-200), about which a great deal of the action of the play revolves (cf. 392 ff., 466ff, 560 ff., etc.).

Meanwhile the brother, Menaechmus Sosicles, with his slave Messenio, has just arrived in Epidamnus by sea (226 ff.), looking for his brother (230-32). They have been searching for the past six years (234) over the civilized world (cf. 235-38); Menaechmus is resolved not to abandon the search until he finds his brother, or proof that his brother is dead (242-45). This is his first visit to Epidamnus (305-6, 400).

The Menaechmi begins with a prologue which contains a complete account of the presuppositions. All essential facts are repeated in the play itself; however, there is a certain amount of detail which does not occur later, particularly in regard to the steps by which Menaechmus I reached Epidamnus (cf. Prol. 24 ff.), the details of his adoption, of the death of his benefactor, and of his inheritance of an enormous fortune (57-68). From the play itself we learn only that Menaechmus I had gone with his father to Tarentum, his place of trade, that he had strayed away in the crowd and was carried off (1112-13), that he is wealthy (cf. 1. 1), and that he has married a wife with a large dowry (766-67)

This information is sufficient for the purposes of the action.

The play opens (i. 1) with a soliloquy by Peniculus, a hanger-on of Menaechmus I's. The only information given by the scene is that Menaechmus is prosperous and wealthy, and a jolly-good-fellow (cf. 98 ff.). In the following scene (i. 2) Menaechmus himself enters and is portrayed as something of a rake (cf. 152 ff., 171 ff.), and on bad terms with his wife (cf. 110 ff.); the only specific information given is that he has a mistress, Erotium (171-72), and that he has stolen a mantle belonging to his wife, which he intends to give to Erotium (130). The information regarding the theft of the mantle is of considerable importance, for a great deal of the action of the play is built around it (cf. 392 ff., 466 ff., 560 ff., etc.). In the next scene (i. 3) Erotium appears; Menaechmus presents her with the mantle, and a luncheon is arranged for the three. Erotium sends (i. 4) her cook to market to buy provisions; this provides for the cook's reappearance somewhat later (ii. 2), which brings about the initial confusion.

Menaechmus II and his slave, Messenio, appear at the beginning of the second act (ii. 1), and we learn some essential facts regarding them. They have come by sea to Epidamnus looking for Menaechmus II's twin brother, and have evidently just landed (266-32); they have been searching for him for the past six years, traveling all over the world in their search (233-38). The action begins with the following scene (ii. 2) in which Erotium's cook returns from market and takes Menaechmus II for Menaechmus I.

By the beginning of the action, then, the audience is in possession of all the essential facts necessary for the understanding of the development. This exposition is spread over several scenes, two of which (i. 2, 3), at least, serve largely for characterization and the depiction of atmosphere. Obviously two

sets of facts must be presented, one in regard to Menaechmus I, the other in regard to Menaechmus II; neither Menaechmus can be allowed to be aware of the other's presence; this problem is solved by having Menaechmus II arrive from abroad after the facts in regard to Menaechmus I have been revealed. Thus this more or less diffused expository section is due to the structure of the plot.

The presuppositions affecting the recognition are reserved, in detail, until the recognition scene (v. 9) when the brothers are at last brought face to face. There we learn how the twins were separated in boyhood, and how they came to have the same name.¹ The technique employed here, then, is that which may be regarded as normal in a recognition play. The situation at the opening of the play is completely set forth before the beginning of the action; the presuppositions in regard to the recognition are reserved until the recognition scene itself.

The expository technique of the Curculio is quite similar. A youth is in love with a girl owned by a leno. A Miles, who also is in love with the same girl, has arranged to buy her, and has deposited the purchase price with a banker, with the understanding that upon the receipt of a letter sealed with the Miles' ring the banker is to turn the money over to the leno and receive the girl; it is also part of the contract that if the girl should prove to be freeborn the leno is to refund the purchase price. By stealing

¹We may perhaps call attention to a suggestion of the recognition which occurs earlier, though it is of no particular importance since the recognition is clearly inevitable as soon as the brothers meet. Erotium (ii. 3), in order to prove that she knows Menaechmus II, whom she is mistaking for Menaechmus I, says that he is Menaechmus, the son of Moschus, born in Syracuse (407-8). The only function served by her giving this information here is to increase Menaechmus II's confusion in a very amusing manner.

the Miles' ring and forging a letter the youth and his parasite obtain the girl; by means of the same ring she is eventually recognized as the Miles' long-lost sister, and the leno is forced to turn over the money he had received. The facts, in detail, are as follows:

Planesium, a freeborn girl (607), daughter of Periphanes (636, 641) and Cleobula (643), was taken by her nurse, Archestrata (643), to see the show at the Dionysiac festival. A hurricane arose, the seats caved in, and someone seized her and carried her off (644-50). She was wearing a ring at the time, one sent her by her brother on her birthday (653-57). She was sold to a leno (cf. 43), Cappadox, of Epidarus (341), who bought her for ten minae; he has never set eyes upon the seller since (528-30); he has treated her well and modestly (518, 698); he intends to make a courtesan of her (46), though as yet she has never consorted with men (57, cf. 51). She is in love with a youth, Phaedromus, who loves her equally (46-47, 177, 188). The leno demands now thirty minae, now a talent for her (63-64); Phaedromus is without funds (69, 142, 334), but has sent his parasite, Curculio, to Caria (three days ago --206), to ask a friend of his for a loan (67-68, 206-7, 225, 275, 329-30, 339); he expects him back today (143-44, 206-7); the chum, however, proves to be unable to supply any funds (302-4).

Meanwhile, as we learn from Curculio's report upon his return (11. 3), a Miles, who finally proves to be Planesium's brother, has bought Planesium (cf. 356) from Cappadox for thirty minae, with an added ten minae¹ for her jewelry and clothing (343-44); he has deposited the money with the banker, Lyco, who, upon receipt of a letter from the Miles sealed with his ring, has orders to assist the bearer in getting the girl from the leno, together with her jewelry and clothing (339-48, 409-10, 488, 535-36); Cappadox has taken oath to perform his part of the transaction (566, 485);² he had promised, in the presence of Lyco and the Miles, to return the money if the girl was proved to be freeborn (490-91, 666-69, 709 ff.).

¹The ten minae for clothing and jewelry (344) must be included in the thirty minae for the girl (343) rather than added to it, unless we consider that there is a discrepancy in the amounts. For, from vss. 345-48, the full amount necessary has been deposited with Lyco (cf. especially 348: ut mulierem a lenone cum auro et veste abduceret), and this amount, according to 490-92, 535-36, 666 is thirty minae; for a detailed discussion of the difficulty, see Langen, Plaut. Studien, pp. 134 ff.

²The oath to which Cappadox refers in 458 (quid quod iuratus sum?) apparently bound him to perform his part of the bargain; cf. 566: quod fui iuratus feci; 569-70: illa [Planesium] abductast, tu auferere hinc a me, si perges mihi male loqui, profecto, quod ego nisi malum nil debeo.

Curculio has managed to steal the Miles' ring (360-63, 584, 630), which, incidentally, was given the Miles by his father before his death (636-39)--it had originally been the Miles' mother's (603)--and which leads eventually to the girl's identification (595 ff.).

The preliminary exposition extends over several scenes. Phaedromus and his slave, Palinurus, are found, as the play opens (i. 1), on their way to make a night call upon the former's sweetheart. The scene relates the situation as far as Phaedromus knows it: he is in love with a virtuous girl held by a leno (43-57); the leno is holding out for a high price (63-64); Phaedromus has sent his parasite off to Caria to ask a friend there for a loan; otherwise Phaedromus does not know where to find the money (67-69). The only other semi-essential expository information which appears before the arrival of Curculio (ii. 3) is that Curculio had been sent to Caria three days ago, and Phaedromus expects him back to-day (143-44, 206-7); this is obviously mere preparation for the appearance of the parasite. The scene-complex which follows the opening scene (i. 2, 3; ii. 1, 2) is devoted almost entirely to atmosphere, humor, and the introduction of characters.

The exposition, however, is not yet complete. Curculio arrives home (ii. 3) from his trip to Caria with important news. He was unable to obtain the loan which was the purpose of his trip, but while there he met a Miles, and in the course of a conversation learned that the Miles had bought a girl in Epidaurus,¹ and had deposited the purchase price with Lyco, a banker; upon receipt of a letter, sealed with the Miles' ring, the banker is to obtain the girl from the leno and turn her over to the bearer

¹This is the first mention of the scene of the play (341). Leo, *Pl. F.*², p. 221, considers this conclusive evidence that both the *Curculio* and the Greek original were preceded by prologues, since the action does not take place in Athens. Leo observes (pp. 218 ff.) that in all other similar cases the scene is indicated in a prologue. But cf. Legrand, *Daos*, p. 504, n. 1.

of the letter. At a drinking party Curculio accidentally learned that the girl to whom the Miles referred is actually Phaedromus' sweetheart. Accordingly he stole the Miles' ring and beat a hasty retreat. He suggests that they prepare a letter to the banker, using the soldier's seal, and obtain the girl. The action may be said to begin with the formation of the plan (364 ff.).¹ The divided exposition is obviously due to the use of the device of the returning traveller.

The exposition, so far as it concerns the immediate situation, is complete before the action begins. Certain presuppositions, however, do not appear until the denouement (v. 1 ff.), in which Planesium is finally recognized as the Miles' sister. The facts are presented to the audience as they are learned by the interested characters themselves. The details of the disaster in which Planesium was lost are given fully. The recognition is of course prepared for by the emphasis in the preliminary exposition upon the fact that the girl is virtuous (cf. 57, 51). Summarizing the technique employed, we observe that the divided preliminary exposition, spread over several scenes, is complete before the beginning of the action; certain presuppositions, as we observed in the case of the Menaechmi, are withheld until the recognition.

The expository technique of the Captivi does not differ materially from that of the Curculio. The action revolves around

¹Leo, Pl. F.², pp. 196-97, concludes that the action begins with the appearance of Curculio (ii. 3); he compares the Stichus, in which he considers the action as beginning with the appearance of Pinacium (ii. 1). The two instances, in my opinion, however, are not strictly parallel. Curculio appears with information which is clearly explanatory of the situation as it stands at the opening of the play. The action does not really begin until the attempt to utilize the information is actually started, as it is at the end of the scene. In the Stichus Pinacium simply reports the arrival of the brothers; the exposition is complete before his appearance.

the efforts of a father to effect the return of a son who has become a war-captive. In the course of arranging an exchange of prisoners he unwittingly buys a second son, who had been lost in infancy. The play ends with a recognition.

Hegio, a citizen of Aetolia (cf. 94), had two sons (7, 759-62, 875-76, etc.). One of them, when he was four years old, was stolen by a slave (8, 18, 760, 875-76, 972, 981, 1011), who took to his heels (9, 18, 972) and sold the boy in Elis (9, 972-74, 979, 1012) for six minae (974, 979, 1012) to the father of Philocrates (10, 17, 974, 979, 981, 1012), Theodoromedes (635, 993), a member of a wealthy, important family in Elis (30-31, 169-71, 277 ff., 298-300, 318-19). Since that time Hegio has had no trace of either his son or the slave who stole him (761). Theodoromedes, who always treated the boy kindly (245), gave him to his son (19-20, 981, 1012-13); the two lads were about the same age (20, 544, 630, 981, 1013), and grew up together (720, 991-92); the stolen boy was called Paegnium, at first (984); later his name was changed to Tyndarus (984). Though he knows that he was born free (cf. 628) he has only a vague recollection that his father was named Hegio (1016-17).

Twenty years later (980) war broke out between the Aetolians and the Eleans (24, 93), and Philopolemus, Hegio's other son, was taken prisoner (25, 92, 144, 261, 310-12, 330, 364-65, 762); he was bought by an Elean doctor, Menarchus (26, 334-35), who is a client of Philocrates' father (335). Hegio has been buying up Elean captives (27-29, 98-101, 126, 458-59, 508), hoping to get hold of one he can exchange for his captive son (27-29, 98-101); among those he has bought is Aristophontes, a relative and sodalis of Philocrates, who knows Tyndarus (528, 630, 644, 698). Hegio heard yesterday (cf. 717) that an Elean knight of the highest rank and connections had been captured (30-32); accordingly he bought him, together with his slave, from the quaestors (33-34, 110, 169-71, 246, 277-97, 298-300, 452-53, 499-500) at a high price (258); these prisoners are actually Philocrates and Hegio's own son, though neither father nor son is aware of the fact (4, 21, 29, 50, passim; cf. especially 984-88). The two prisoners, however, have agreed upon a scheme by which the slave may send his master home (35-36, 224, 249); as a result they have exchanged clothes and names with each other (37, 224, 249)--Philocrates is calling himself Tyndarus, and vice versa (38-39, 533 ff., 675-79).

The Captivi has a prologue which gives a full statement of the presuppositions and of the situation at the opening of the play. The prologue, however, contains no information which is not repeated later.

The play opens with a monologue (1. 1) by Ergasilus, a

parasite of Philopolemus'. In the course of his soliloquy he gives a fairly complete outline of the situation, so far as he knows it: the Aetolians and Eleans are at war; Philopolemus is a prisoner in Elis; Hegio has taken to buying up prisoners of war in order to effect the exchange of his son (92-101, cf. Prol. 24-29). In the following scene (i. 2) Hegio appears and some additions in the nature of definite details are made to Ergasilus' account. Hegio bought two captives yesterday from the quaestors; one is a young Elean prisoner of a noble, wealthy family, whom he counts upon being able to exchange for his son (169-70, cf. Prol. 30-34); he also has some other prisoners at his brother's (126).¹

In the third scene (ii. 1) the two captives obtain permission from the lorarius who has them in charge to hold a private conversation. From their mutual exhortation we learn that they have exchanged rôles (224, 249; cf. Prol. 35-39); the master is passing as the slave and vice versa. With the following scene (ii. 2), in which Hegio appears and makes arrangements with the prisoners for an exchange, the action begins.²

The information essential for the action preceding the recognition (iv. 2 ff.) has now been given completely; no further facts appear until just before the denouement begins; then Hegio,

¹This information is rather essential, as it prepares for the discovery of the prisoners' exchange of rôles later on in the play (cf. iii. 4).

²Leo, Pl. F.², p. 204, considers that the action begins with the conversation between the prisoners (ii. 1). This scene, however, seems to me to be purely expository (cf. Langen, *Plaut. Studien*, p. 116: "Die Unterredung selbst ist ziemlich überflüssig für die Entwicklung der Handlung und nur der Zuschauer wegen eingelegt"); it simply informs the audience of the exchange of rôles, an exchange which has already taken place before the play begins (cf. Langen, pp. 116-17), and is therefore a part of the immediate situation; if the exchange of rôles were effected in this scene it would necessarily be part of the action. The action must be considered to begin with the making of the arrangements for the exchange of prisoners.

in the course of a soliloquy (751 ff.) induced by the collapse of his hope of ransoming his son recalls that he lost one son, a four-year-old boy that a slave kidnapped, with never a trace of slave or son since (759-61; cf. Prol. 7-8, 18). This comes as more or less of a surprise, as Ergasilus stated definitely (150) that Philopolemus was Hegio's only son. This hint is dropped directly before the denouement begins; in the following scene (iv. 1) Ergasilus appears with the report that he has good news for Hegio, and in the next scene (iv. 2) he announces that Philopolemus has returned bringing with him the slave, Stalagmus, who stole the four-year-old boy. The remaining presuppositions finally appear fully in the course of the recognition; the facts are presented as they are learned by the interested characters.

Thus, discounting, of course, the prologue, the technique closely resembles that of the Curculio; the preliminary exposition is spread over several scenes, and, after the beginning of the action, no further facts appear until just before the recognition, in the course of which the remaining presuppositions are revealed; the preliminary exposition is divided because no one character knows all the facts.

The Truculentus depicts the exploitation by Phronesium, a free professional meretrix, of three lovers whom she has entangled in her toils.

The first of these is Diniarchus, a young man of Athens. Formerly, as long as his property held out (cf. 213-14), he had occupied the first place in Phronesium's so-called affections (79, 166-67); now, although he still has some property left (174), Phronesium has been the recipient of most of it (113, 139, 213-14, 217-18, etc.), and he has been forced to yield his position of preëminence to a Babylonian miles (81-84, 213-14). Though he is angry with Phronesium (cf. 77-78), he is still sufficiently enamored to be appeased easily (cf. 434 ff.). Phronesium regards him as a friend, and speaks freely to him of her plans (215, 388). Diniarchus, who has been at Lemnos on an embassy on public service, returned to Athens the day before yesterday (91-92, 127, 185, 355). Some time since (cf.

774) Diniarchus had been betrothed to the daughter of Callicles (771, 825); this match, apparently, had been broken off, for Callicles had betrothed her a second time to the son of a kinsman of his by marriage (848-49). Meanwhile Diniarchus had violently (813) ravished Callicles' daughter, under the influence of wine (828); he has been hoping that his misdeeds have been concealed (795). When the child was born the girl's mother bade her maid give it to Sura, Phronesium's hair-dresser (789-91, 796); Sura took the child to Phronesium (799), at Phronesium's request (797-98); Phronesium has passed it off as her own son (804-5; see below).

The second lover is the Babylonian miles mentioned above. Phronesium had been his mistress for a year while he was in Athens; he had kept her as though she were his wife (391-93); Diniarchus was aware of this affair (393). Led by her self-confessed greed (459-60, 19, etc.), she has pretended to the miles, who has been absent from Athens for ten months (497-98, cf. 402), that she was pregnant and has borne him a child (18, 86-87, 194 ff., 390, 472, 498); he has lately sent her a letter, saying that he will make trial of how much she values him: if she should bring up the child she expects to bear, she should have all his property (395-400); since he has sent her word she expects him to arrive shortly (84-85, 203-4, 412-13, 474). To carry out her deception she needed a child to palm off as the miles' (404, cf. 88a); accordingly her mother ordered the servant-maids to search for a boy or a girl to be passed off as Phronesium's. Sura, the hair-dresser, who lives nearby, returned with a boy, who she reported was given to her (401-9, cf. 797 ff.); Phronesium is now acting as though she has just lain in (413-14, cf. 195-96, 475 ff., 500 ff.); the child is now five days old (423-24, 509).

The third lover is Strabax, a young man from the country (246-47), one of Phronesium's neighbors (207, 303-4) on the household's frequent visits to town (cf. 682); he is a constant patron of Phronesium's by way of the garden wall (248-49, 282, 303-4); he visited her, without the knowledge of his father, last night (248-49); in his complete infatuation (cf. 660-62) he is misappropriating twenty *minae* paid him at the farm for some Tarentine sheep formerly purchased from his father (645 ff.). He has one slave, Truculentus, who is aware of his escapades (296 ff.), and disapproves of them (cf. 250-53, 313-14), but who does not prove impregnable against the wiles of Astaphium, a servant of Phronesium's (673 ff.).

The Truculentus opens with a lengthy monologue by Diniarchus on lovers and courtesans and their ways. In applying the discussion to himself (77 ff.) he gives considerable information regarding the situation, as much, in fact, as he can know, since he arrived from Lemnos only the day before yesterday (91-92) and

has not seen Phronesium since his return (cf. 116 ff., 355 ff.). We learn that he has been involved with Phronesium, that his popularity has waned, and that, in order to ensnare a Babylonian miles whose arrival is expected shortly, Phronesium is pretending to be pregnant by the Miles and is searching for a child to palm off upon him.¹ Diniarchus is not at all convinced of her pregnancy; his information is from hearsay, as appears from the following scene (cf. 194). Astaphium appears in the second scene (i. 2) and engages in considerable banter with Diniarchus. His reception is rather cool until he reveals that he still has some property left; he is then cordially invited in. He mentions the story of Phronesium's being brought to bed by the Miles, and Astaphium insists upon the truth of the story (194-201), and more or less convinces Diniarchus (cf. 202-3).

After Diniarchus' exit Astaphium indulges in a monologue (ii. 1) and introduces the third lover, a youth from the country, who paid them a visit the night before. In the following scene (ii. 2), Astaphium's interview with Truculentus, the information in regard to the country lover is slightly amplified. The scene serves largely, however, for the characterization of Truculentus; it also introduces the slight secondary plot, which consists of the corruption of Truculentus by Astaphium (cf. iii. 1). In the next scene (ii. 3) Diniarchus reappears, and in the following scene (ii. 4) Phronesium finally emerges. In the course of the dialogue which ensues Phronesium officially, as it were, summarizes the situation in regard to the Miles, as well as in regard

¹Cf. Prol. 18-19:

Ea se peperisse puerum simulat militi,
quo citius rem ab eo auorrat cum puluisculo.

This is the only expository information that the prologue, as it now stands, contains.

to Diniarchus' place in her affections. The only important additional information contained in the scene is the fact that the child she is using as the decoy is an abandoned baby obtained through the efforts of Phronesium's hair-dresser (401-9); this provides a very slight hint of the denouement (cf. iv. 3). This scene (ii. 4), while it is almost entirely expository, may also be considered the beginning of the action. This is due to the peculiar situation; Diniarchus is reënsnared by Phronesium's account since the fact that she has told him everything leads him to believe that she must love him after all (cf. 434 ff.); thus the one account serves both as exposition and as development.¹

The Truculentus rather unexpectedly introduces a recognition in which the identity of the child employed by Phronesium is cleared up. In the course of the recognition some further facts about Diniarchus' past are revealed. The information obtained

¹The technique in regard to the introduction of the information about Phronesium's plot against the Miles is worthy of special notice. Diniarchus (i. 1) suggests (correctly) that there is no truth in the report that Phronesium is pregnant. In the following scene (i. 2) Astaphium convinces Diniarchus (and presumably the audience, were it not for the statement in the prologue [18-19]) that the report is true; finally (ii. 4) Phronesium herself sets forth the exact situation, which agrees with Diniarchus' original suspicions.

There are other examples of this technique of keeping the audience, for a time, under a false impression, although they are not numerous. In the Cistellaria, e.g., we are told in the first scene that Selenium is the actual daughter of Melaenis (38 ff.); the true situation, however, is presented by the monologue of the Lena which follows (i. 2; cf. pp. 55-56). In the Adelphoe the audience does not learn that Aeschinus' activities have been on his brother's behalf instead of on his own until ii. 3, 4 (cf. pp. 81 ff.). In the Heauton Clitipho's comment (225-26), that Clinia loves a girl brought up in virtue, acts as a corrective to any false impression which the spectator may have gathered from Menedemus' account of the affair (cf. 97 ff.). Later on in the same play a false impression which the audience shares with Clinia (ii. 3), due to a misinterpretation of Syrus' and Dromo's remarks (245 ff.), is quickly cleared up by Syrus' explanation (263 ff.). An extreme example is found in the Asinaria, in which we are led to believe that Demaenetus is aiding his son out of pure philanthropy (cf. 64 ff.); the truth does not appear until late in the play (734-36); cf. note, p. 5.

has no particular effect upon the main action of the play. At the end of iv. 2 Diniarchus sees old Callicles,¹ who was a connection of his by marriage, bringing two female slaves in bonds, the one, the hair-dresser of Phronesium's, the other, Callicles' own servant-maid; Diniarchus manifests alarm lest his misdeeds be found out (770-74); this is the first intimation in the play that he is guilty of any wrongdoing. In the following scene (iv. 3) Callicles questions the servants and finally elicits the information that the child is Callicles' illegitimate grandchild; Diniarchus, who had been betrothed to Callicles' daughter, is the father; apparently the girl had meanwhile been betrothed to another suitor. Diniarchus agrees to marry her.²

By way of summary we observe that the exposition necessary for the action preceding the recognition is complete before the beginning of the action; it is spread over several scenes; this

¹On the mechanical rôle of Callicles, see Prescott, "Inorganic rôles in Roman Comedy," Class. Phil., XV (1920), 277.

²The lack of preparation for the recognition scene, and the scant information given, especially in the matter of the double betrothal of Callicles' daughter (771, 825, 848) leads Leo (Pl. F.2, p. 206) to conclude that the original had a prologue giving the presuppositions; the present prologue he regards as having been freely altered by Plautus. He decides that the missing presuppositions must have dropped out after vs. 17 (cf. also Wheeler, "The Plot of the Epidicus," AJP, XXXVIII (1917), 255, n. 1, where, in referring to Leo, he remarks ". . . it is practically certain that the needed information has fallen out of the prologue, cf. the lacuna after vs. 17."). In regard to the obscurity caused by the lack of information about Diniarchus' affair with Callicles' daughter, however, we may perhaps compare the Captivi. There (iv. 1) Ergasilus appears with the information that Philocrates and Philopolemus have returned, bringing with them Stalagmus, the slave who stole away Hegio's four-year-old son (873-76). There is not the slightest explanation as to how Stalagmus was recognized in Elis; Philocrates, who, one would expect, should at least know the reason for bringing back Stalagmus, is ignorant of the whole situation (cf. 978 ff.); we must infer that Philopolemus happened upon Stalagmus in Elis and recognized him; at the same time this is rendered rather improbable by the fact that the kidnapping occurred twenty years ago (980). There is no explanation given in the prologue. Cf. Lessing, Sämt. Schriften (1886-1924), III, 105-6, 133-34; Legrand, Daos, pp. 421, 394.

is due, at least in part, to the necessity of introducing considerable information and, at the same time, preventing this information from becoming known to certain characters; this, for example, explains the introduction of the information about Strabax by Astaphium rather than by Phronesium in her interview with Diniarchus. The facts in regard to Diniarchus' past are introduced in the recognition; the only respect in which the recognition differs from the technique hitherto observed is in the comparative obscurity caused by the use of vague references rather than of direct statement.

In the Epidicus a youth returns from a campaign, bringing a war-captive with whom he has fallen in love, and whom he has bought on credit. Meanwhile at home a slave, whom he had instructed to buy a girl with whom he was in love before his departure, has performed his commission, convincing the youth's father that he was buying his own long-lost daughter. The action of the play consists of an intrigue designed to cheat the father out of enough money to pay for the war-captive; this captive eventually proves to be the half-sister of the youth who brought her home.

Periphanes Platenius (435, 448), a famous soldier (449-51), has had, a long time ago (545), an affair with Philippa, a poor girl (540b, 555-56) of good family (169); this liason, which took place in Epidaurus (540a, 554, 636), resulted in the birth, in Thebes (636), of a daughter, Teles-tis (168-72, 540, 542, 635-36, cf. 88, 568). He later married, in Athens, a woman who brought him a rich dowry (180) but who is now dead (173 ff.); Periphanes is considering marrying the mother of his daughter (168-72).

Periphanes' son by his Athenian marriage, Stratippocles, has, at the opening of the play, together with his slave, Thesprio, just returned from a campaign against Thebes (15-16, 20-22, 206); while there he bought a well-born (107, cf. 43) captive with whom he is in love (45, 64-65, 135, 148, 362ff), from the booty (43-44, 156, 362-63, 370, 621); the purchase price was forty minae, obtained from a danista at Thebes at a nummus per diem per minam interest (51-54, 114-15, 122, 141-42, 626).¹

¹On the inconsistencies in the sums of money mentioned as paid for the girls, see A. L. Wheeler, "The Plot of the Epidicus," AJP, XXXVIII (1917), 241-42.

the danista has accompanied him home, looking for his money (55, 621, 646). This captive actually is Telestis, Stratippocles' half-sister (cf. 641-42); he has done nothing to sully her innocence (110). Her mother, Philippa, has heard that Telestis has been bought by a young Athenian (602-3) and she has come to Athens in search of her (532-33).

Before Stratippocles left for Thebes he commissioned his slave, Epidicus, to buy from a leno a fidicina, Acropolistis, with whom he was in love (46-48, 87-90, 135); during his absence he sent Epidicus frequent letters on the subject (58-59, 131-32, 134, 138). Stratippocles' affair with this girl has become more or less a matter of common gossip (191, 507, 508); it has reached the ears of his father, who thinks his son should be married immediately (190, 267, 283, 361). Epidicus meanwhile has carried out Stratippocles' commission (46-48, 130-32, 508-9), and, the day before yesterday (367, 697), purchased the girl, persuading Periphanes into believing that he was buying his own daughter who had been captured and brought to Athens (352-53, 357, 365-68, 400, 542, 563-65, 568); Epidicus had coached Acropolistis as to the part she was to play (591-92). Periphanes has seen his daughter only once (600) and took Epidicus' word for the identification (563-65, 597-98); Epidicus, apparently, had seen Telestis at Thebes recently enough to be able to recognize her (cf. 635 ff.). It also happens that, unknown to Stratippocles (153 ff.), a wealthy miles from Euboea (153; cf. 300: from Rhodes) is in love with Acropolistis and is willing to take her off Stratippocles' hands (153-55, 299-301, 457).

The play opens (i. 1) with a dialogue between the two slaves, Thesprio and Epidicus. Thesprio and his young master, Stratippocles, have just arrived from a campaign abroad (15-16, 21-22); Stratippocles is anxious to avoid his father (42, 70-71) because he has brought back a war-captive with whom he is in love and whom he bought from the spoils (43-44); he bought the girl on credit with money obtained from a money-lender at Thebes who has accompanied him home (51-55). We also learn the situation as it has developed at home, during the absence of Stratippocles. Before he left he had commissioned Epidicus to go to a leno and purchase a girl with whom he was then in love; Epidicus has carried out his instructions (46-48);¹ he had received daily letters from

¹The variance between Epidicus' explanation of the situation to Thesprio in 45-49, and his decision to keep his own counsel, 59, has received considerable attention; for a review of the discussion, and bibliography, see Jachmann, Plautinisches und

Stratippocles regarding the matter (59); Epidicus has convinced Stratippocles' father that he was buying his own daughter (87-90).

In the second scene (i. 2) Stratippocles and his friend Chaeribulus enter in the midst of a conversation and we obtain some further information: the captive is well-born (107-8); Stratippocles has done nothing to sully her innocence (110); this is, of course, a stereotyped hint of a recognition. Epidicus joins the conversation, reports his success in carrying out his instructions (130 ff.), and, upon learning that Stratippocles is no longer interested (cf. 135), announces that there is a rich Euboean miles who is in love with the girl he had purchased¹--a new phase of the situation upon which Epidicus bases part of his intrigue (cf. ii. 2).

In the third scene (ii. 1) Periphanes, the father of Stratippocles, and his friend Apoecides, appear. From their brief conversation it appears that Periphanes is considering marrying a poor woman of good family who bore him a daughter (168-72); his former wife is dead (173-74); here again a hint of the recognition is provided.

The action begins with the following scene (ii. 2) in which Epidicus begins his intrigue against Periphanes.² At this point, then, the exposition of the general situation at the opening of the play is complete. The more remote presuppositions, however, have been no more than hinted at--the sole reference to

Attisches, pp. 221 ff.; Jachmann concludes (p. 223) that "45-49 stammen nicht aus dem Original, sondern von Plautus."

¹On the confusion in the references to the Miles (Euboeicus miles, 153; miles Rhodius, 300) see Langen, Plaut. Studien, pp. 140 f.

²Leo, Pl. F.², p. 198, considers that the action begins with ii. 1; but cf. Wheeler, op. cit., p. 238. The action does not actually get underway until Epidicus begins his deception.

them is that Periphanes had once had an affair with a poor woman who bore him a daughter (168-72).

No further expository information is given until the beginning of the fourth act (iv. 1). The action up to this point consists of Epidicus' intrigue against Periphanes, in which he pretends to buy the sweetheart with whom the old men believe Stratippocles is involved, in order that they may send her away with the miles, and the discovery by the old men that they have been tricked. At iv. 1, however, Philippa (the mother of the captive girl) arrives from abroad (533). She is recognized by Periphanes as the girl he had wronged in Epidaurus (540) and whose daughter he thinks he has bought (542). He sends for Acropolistis and Epidicus' deceit is finally brought to light (iv. 2); we now learn that Periphanes had had no means of identification but had taken Epidicus' word in the matter (597-98); he defends his mistake by the fact that he had seen his daughter only once before (600).

In the following scene (v. 1) Epidicus and the captive, Telestis, finally come face to face and Epidicus recognizes her as the daughter of Periphanes and Philippa, born in Thebes and begotten in Epidaurus (635-36); and we learn an important fact: Epidicus reminds Telestis that he had brought her a present on her birthday (638-40); we can deduce from this and from the fact that he recognizes her instantly that his visit was made in the fairly recent past; this explains Periphanes' apparent gullibility in trusting Epidicus' identification and in purchasing the girl vouched for by him.

Thus the technique displayed may be summarized as follows: the general situation at the opening of the play is given completely in the expository scenes before the beginning of the action;

the more remote presuppositions, which have no particular bearing on the action until the recognition begins, are not revealed until they become necessary. The details of the presuppositions are given less fully than in the majority of the other plays containing recognitions; they are given, however, in sufficient fullness to enable the situation to be comprehended easily.

The course of the main intrigue of the Epidicus is obscure.¹ It should be observed, however, that the obscurity is not caused by lack of fullness in the explanation of the situation at the opening of the play, or in the summary of the presuppositions at the end. The chief difficulty is found in following Epidicus' transactions in hiring a fidicina to deceive the old men.² This is a matter of development within the play, and does not concern us particularly in the present study.

The two plays which follow differ from the preceding group in one respect; the information necessary for the recognition is introduced before the actual recognition takes place; in both cases, however, this information becomes necessary for the development of the action at the point at which it appears, so that its introduction is dictated by the structure of the individual play.

In the Cistellaria the youth has been living with a girl whom he met, and with whom he fell in love, at a festival. Upon learning that the youth's father is planning a match for him with a relative, the girl deserts the young man. The development section of the play is fragmentary, but the youth's sweetheart is

¹For a full analysis of the difficulties in the Epidicus, suggestions as to their source, and bibliography, see Wheeler, op. cit.; for further discussion see Fraenkel, Plaut. im Plautus, pp. 313 ff.; Mesk, Wiener Stud., XLVII (1929), 61-67; Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches, pp. 209-24.

²Cf. Wheeler, op. cit., pp. 244 ff.

finally discovered to be the half-sister of the girl whom his father was desirous of having him marry.

A long time ago a Lemnian merchant, who had come to attend a Dionysiac festival at Sicyon, outraged a maiden (cf. 616), late at night, in the road, under the influence of wine (156-59). He immediately fled, returning to his home in Lemnos (160-62). Nine months later the maiden found herself the mother of a baby girl (162-63; cf. 617-18). Not knowing whom to charge with the crime, she gave the child to a slave of her father's to expose (164-66; cf. 124, 618, 665). He did so (167; cf. 619); a woman (Lena) picked it up (167; cf. 619) from an alley (124) near the hippodrome (549); the slave watched (cf. 620) secretly, and observed that she gave it to a courtesan (cf. 38-39), Melaenis (168-71); she brought her up properly and respectably as her own daughter (172-73, 39-40, 145-46; cf. also i. 1 *passim* in which Selenium obviously regards Melaenis as her mother), alleging a liaison with a foreign lover (143-44); she preserved, however, the *crepundia* which had been exposed with the child (635-36, 664-65); the girl is now seventeen years old (755).

The Lemnian later married a neighbor and relative of his there (173-74; cf. 611-12); upon her death (cf. 613) he at once returned to Sicyon (175-77), and married the same woman he had outraged long before (cf. 620), and recognized her as such (177-79); upon learning from her of the birth of the daughter and the exposure (180-82) he at once ordered the same slave to search for the woman who picked up the child (182-84; cf. 621); the slave accordingly is devoting himself constantly to his task (184-87).

One day Melaenis and her so-called daughter attended the festival of Dionysus (89-90). On their way home Alcesimarchus, a young Sicyonian (190), of excellent family (130), noticed them (90-91); he began to cultivate Selenium and her mother (92-93; cf. 487), with the result that they fell in love (95; cf. 68-71, 109, 131-32, 191-93, 214-15, 238-39, 298-99). Melaenis yielded to Selenium's desire not to be known as a courtesan, and let her live with Alcesimarchus (83-85); they have been occupying a house that Alcesimarchus rented (cf. 319). She has not been intimate with any man except him (86-88); he swore solemnly to her mother that he would marry her (98-99); she in turn had given him her pledge (241) that she would pass her days with him as his wife (243).

Alcesimarchus' father, however, is still alive (131, 190), and wishes to give his son a wife (99, 195), a wealthy (305, 492) Lemnian relative of his, who lives next door (99-100, 492, 530); he has kept his son at the villa on the farm the last six days (225-26, cf. 73-74, 237); he has never seen his son's sweetheart (318). Melaenis, on learning the circumstances (101-3), has summoned Selenium home (105, 195-96).

The *Cistellaria* opens (i. 1) with an effective dialogue scene between Selenium, Gymnasium, and the Lena, Gymnasium's moth-

er. The scene gives a clear picture of the situation at the opening of the play. We learn that both the Lena and Selenium's (so-called, cf. 139 ff.) mother were meretrices (38-39), that the Lena forced Gymnasium into her own profession (41-42), but that Selenium has been true to one lover (83-88). We also learn that Selenium is in love with Alcesimarchus, that he had sworn solemnly to marry her, but that now he must marry another girl, a Lemnian relative of his, due to compulsion placed upon him by his father (83 ff.); her mother is angry with her for not having returned home after finding this out, and has summoned her (98 ff.). The drunken monologue of the Lena which follows (i. 2) serves primarily to correct the impression given throughout the first scene (cf. 38-40, 83, 96, etc.) that Melaenis is actually Selenium's mother.¹ Instead, we learn that Selenium had actually been abandoned as an infant, that the Lena had found her in an alley, and had given her to Melaenis, that Melaenis had reared her as her own daughter, and that the Lena and Melaenis have kept this a secret (123-24, 133-46). This information, of course, is a preparation for the eventual recognition of Selenium.

A deferred prologue, spoken by Auxilium, follows (i. 3). This gives a full account of the presuppositions, including the previous history of Selenium's father and mother, the circumstances of Selenium's adoption by Melaenis, the efforts of Selenium's parents to find her, and an account of the present situation of Selenium's love-affair. The prologue contains no information that cannot be gathered in the course of the play itself. The action begins with the appearance of Alcesimarchus in the following scene (ii. 1).

Disregarding the prologue, we may say that the expository

¹See note, p. 47.

information, at least as regards the action of the first part of the play, is complete before the beginning of the action. Somewhere about vs. 380 (if frags. ix, x, xi, xii refer to Lampadio) the action which leads up to the denouement may be considered to begin. We may perhaps surmise that Lampadio, upon his appearance, gave sufficient information to enable the audience to understand his errand. At any rate, upon his next appearance (ii. 2, 3), in his report to his mistress and his interview with Melaenis (ii. 3) we learn the rest of the situation--the situation from the point of view of Demipho and Phanostrata: Demipho had had an affair, which resulted in the birth of a daughter who was abandoned at birth; he had later married; upon the death of his wife he had married the woman with whom he had had his early affair, and learned of the abandoned child; as a result they have been searching for the girl through the efforts of the slave who had abandoned the baby, and who had observed the woman who picked it up (611 ff.).

The action of the play, then, may be said to be divided into two fairly distinct sections; the exposition essential for the first part of the action is given before that action begins; the necessary exposition for the second part of the action, the events leading up to the denouement and the denouement itself, is given when it becomes dramatically effective. This technique does not differ materially from that observed in the plays previously discussed; it is to be noted, however, that here, due largely to the method by which the recognition is effected, the audience becomes aware of the true situation before the actual recognition takes place.

In the Poenulus a youth is in love with one of two sisters held by a leno who refuses to sell the girl. By means of a trick,

consisting of introducing one of the youth's slaves to the leno as a stranger seeking entertainment and then accusing the leno of illegally harboring a slave, he plans to have the leno's whole property adjudged to him by the praetor. Before the trick is completed, however, the girls' father arrives from Carthage in search of them and a double recognition eventually occurs which restores the daughters to their father and reveals Agorastocles as a relative of theirs.

Iachon (cf. 1065) and Hanno, members of a noble and wealthy Carthaginian family (59-60, cf. 1240), were first cousins (59, 1069); Iachon was the son of Hanno's uncle (1069); Iachon's wife, Ampsigura (cf. 1065), was Hanno's cousin on his mother's side (1068). Iachon and Ampsigura had one son, Agorastocles; he was kidnapped at Carthage when seven years old (65-66, 901-2, 987, cf. 1038, 1055, 1058); his father died six years later (67-69, 71, 1067) of grief and made Hanno his heir (70, 1070); Ampsigura also is dead (1067). The boy, Agorastocles, was carried off to Calydon and sold to a certain Antidamus (72-73, 903, 1058) of Aetolia (cf. 1057) who was rich, desirous of children, but a hater of women (73-74, 903-4); Antidamus, who was himself the adoptive son of Demarchus (1060), adopted Agorastocles as his son (76, 1045, 1058-59); upon his death he made Agorastocles his heir (77, 904, cf. 516, 811); it so happened that Antidamus was an hospes of Hanno and of Hanno's father (75, 119-20, 955-58, 1050-51).

Hanno had two daughters, Adelphasium and Anterastylis; when Adelphasium was five and Anterastylis four, they, with their nurse, Giddenis (cf. 1130), were kidnapped from the Megara (83-86, 896-900, cf. 1104-5, 1344-46). They were carried off to Anactorium and the three were sold to a leno, named Lycus (87-92, 896 ff.), by a Sicilian pirate (897) for eighteen minae (897); Lycus, who knew the girls were freeborn (899-900, 1347-48) removed not long before the time at which the play opens to Calydon for business reasons (93-95). From the time of their loss Hanno, who speaks all languages (112-13), had been searching for them continually, by land and sea; he has been pursuing his inquiries particularly among the courtesans (104-11).

The situation at the opening of the play is briefly as follows: Agorastocles is violently in love with Adelphasium (96-97, 140, 153, 196, 198, 203-4, etc.) without any inkling, of course, that she is his kinsman (97); he has never touched her in the slightest degree (98-100, 281, 292, 1096), due largely to the fact that the leno, who is aware of his passion and wishes to exploit him to the fullest extent (101), has refused him any privileges (98, 100, cf. 157-58, 548, 756, 818, 879-80). Agorastocles has promised many times to procure his sweetheart's freedom (360-61) and, as his efforts have failed (362-63) in spite of

the fact that he is supplied with funds (165-66, 345), he has fallen more or less into her disfavor (cf. 330 ff.). A Miles is desperately in love with the younger girl and is desirous of buying her as his mistress (102-3, cf. 497-98). Since it is the Aphrodisia (191, 256, 497, etc.), a fair for courtesans is being held at the temple of Venus, where the dealers meet (339-40, cf. 190-92, 264); it has been decided that today the two girls shall become courtesans (1139-40). It happens also that Hanno arrived by ship at Calydon the evening before the play begins (114-15), in search of his daughters and the son of his cousin (115, 951-53).

The Poenulus¹ opens with a prologue which outlines the presuppositions and the situation at the beginning of the play with considerable detail. All essential information is repeated later on in the play. The information that is not repeated consists, for the most part, merely of realistic detail--the fact that Agorastocles' father died of grief (69), that Agorastocles was stolen six years before his father's death (67), that the leno moved to Calydon for the sake of his business (95), the description of Hanno's wanderings in search of his daughters and his method of inquiry (104-13). One fact of some slight importance is not repeated clearly later; this is that the reason for the leno's refusal to sell Adelphasium is his desire to extort a large amount of money (100-101).²

The play begins with a dialogue scene between Agorastocles and his slave, Milphio, which contains some expository information --Agorastocles is desperately in love (140, 153) with his neighbor, Adelphasium, the elder meretrix that belongs to the leno (154-55);

¹For a recent study of the Poenulus, see B. Krysiniet, Der plautinische Poenulus und sein attisches Vorbild (Diss., München, 1932); reviewed by A. Klotz, BPhW, LIV (1934), 7-21.

²The lack of information upon this point in i. 1 bulks large in the discussion of contamination in the play; cf. e. g., Leo, Pl. E.², pp. 176, 209; the enmity between Agorastocles and the leno, however, is referred to (157-58) in the opening scene, and all that we need to know to understand the action is that the leno is not anxious to sell.

he is at enmity with the leno (157-58). Milphio, who has heard all this before (155), forestalls any further confidences by suggesting a plan for outwitting the leno, the plan already mentioned above. The action begins at this point (163).¹ Leo finds considerable difficulty in the abbreviated exposition before the action begins.² The information given, however, is sufficient for the first part of the action. All we need to know is that Agorastocles is in love, and that the leno refuses to sell the girl.

In the following scene (1. 2)³ the two girls, Adelphasium and Anterastylis appear on their way to the temple of Venus, and are eventually accosted by Agorastocles and Milphio. Some further information is revealed: the girls are sisters (233, 238, 240); Agorastocles has never touched Adelphasium (281, 292);⁴ he has

¹Cf. Leo, Pl. F.2, p. 209. The conditions essential to the carrying out of the plan are given, as usual, upon its formation: Agorastocles has a sum of money in his possession (165-66); Collybiscus, Agorastocles' bailiff, who is unknown to the leno, is in the city (170-71); cf. especially the information in regard to Satorio in Persa 1. 3.

²Leo, Pl. F.2, p. 209.

³For recent discussion of this scene in connection with contamination, as well as for contamination in the Poenulus in general, see Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches, pp. 195-208; Jachmann opposes Fraenkel's view (Plaut. im Plautus, pp. 270 ff.) that "Plautus hat die Szene I 2, aber eben nur diese, aus einem andern Stück übernommen und in den Karchedonios eingelegt" (p. 274).

⁴This is, of course, a stereotyped hint of the recognition; cf. Harsh, "Studies in Dramatic 'Preparation' in Roman Comedy," unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Chicago (1933), p. 49. Jachmann (Charites [Festschrift für Leo], Berlin, 1911) says, particularly in regard to Poen. 281, 292, "den Eindruck erwecken als habe sich Plautus bemüht durch Übertragung eines Motivs aus dem einen Stück ins andere ein Moment der Einheitlichkeit zu schaffen" (p. 255²); Fraenkel (Plaut. im Plautus, p. 219) quotes Jachmann with approval, and believes that 279-82 "ruhrt unverkennbar von Plautus her."

We may mention here v. 350, in which Adelphasium remarks pura sum, comperce amabo me attrectare, Agorastocles. This verse has been used by Langen (Plaut. Studien, pp. 183 ff.) and others (notably by Fraenkel, Plaut. im Plautus, p. 272, who accepts and amplifies Langen's argument) as partial proof that Adelphasium has already become a meretrix in fact, a contradiction to the situation as depicted in the latter part of the play. The line of argument, as stated by Langen, is that the insistence upon her

made Adelphasium many fair promises, none of which have come to anything; he has sworn a hundred times to obtain her freedom; while depending on him she has nowhere obtained other resources for herself (359-63).¹ In the following scene (i. 3), in which Agorastocles and Milphio decide to proceed with their plan, the action gets underway.

With the beginning of Act iv the information necessary for an understanding of the recognitions which follow is introduced.² Syncerastus, a slave of the leno, is returning (iv. 2)

state of purification at the moment shows that "bei anderen Gelegenheiten muss sie also so züchtig nicht gewesen sein, als heute, wo sie das Opfer darbringen will" (p. 183). This argument seems to me entirely beside the point. Adelphasium is obviously in a state of ceremonial purity preparatory to her visit to the temple. It is quite true that she is not always in this state of purification, but this implies absolutely nothing as to her previous condition of chastity or unchastity; her condition at the moment is the result of the performance of certain religious rites, including, as a rule, ceremonial bathing (cf. the elaborate ablutions of the girls, Poen. 217 ff.), as well as, to be sure, the secubitus (on these two observances see Kirby Flower Smith, The Elegies of Albius Tibullus (1913), note on i. 3. 25 and the passages cited there). But to argue that Adelphasium, because of her objection to being touched by profane hands, has already embarked upon the quaestus meretricius, is ridiculous. This line, therefore, is evidence neither one way nor the other.

¹ This technique resembles that of the Amphitruo and the Andria, in which the scene following the beginning of the action serves expository purposes.

² Jachmann (Plautinisches und Attisches, pp. 197 ff.), in maintaining that Milphio's entrance monologue (iv. 1) is an attempt by Plautus to connect sections taken from different plays, remarks (p. 197), "Erst in 821-22 dürfen wir mit einiger Gewissheit glauben attischen Boden zu betreten, aber selbst hier treffen wir auf einen Stein des Anstosses: e fano recipere video se Syncerastum dürfte Milphio eigentlich nicht sagen, denn das konnte er nach dem bisherigen Gange des Stückes nicht wissen, wie es ihm Syncerastus denn auch tatsächlich im Laufe des folgenden Gespräches erst erzählt. Jedenfalls stammt der Auftrittsmonolog Milphios iv 1 in der Hauptsache von Plautus." It seems probable, however, that Jachmann is over-emphasizing the difficulty involved in 821-22; it is true that nothing has been said previously regarding Syncerastus' presence at the sacrifice; but to anyone knowing, as Milphio does, that the leno and his meretrices have been sacrificing, and seeing the leno's slave returning from (presumably) the direction of the temple loaded with the vasa (cf. 847, 863), the assumption that he is coming e fano would certainly be an easy one.

from the temple with the vessels used in the sacrifice which his master has completed. In the course of the scene we learn some essential presuppositions. Syncerastus reveals that Adelphasium and Anterastylis are free by birth--the leno bought them, when little children, of a Sicilian pirate, for eighteen minae, and their nurse for the third. The one who sold them informed Lycus that he was selling children who had been kidnapped; he said that they were free-born, and from Carthage (894-900). The analogy between these circumstances and Agorastocles' early history startles Milphio, and he in turn reveals that Agorastocles was born in Carthage; he was stolen there when about six years old; the person who stole him brought him here and sold him to Milphio's master; he adopted him as his heir before his death (900-904).

The information in regard to the sisters suggests a new line of action--a legal assertion of their freedom (905 ff.). In the following scene (v. 1) Hanno appears with a monologue introducing himself--he had come to see his hospes, Antidamas; he has learned that Antidamas is dead, and is now looking for his son, Agorastocles (955-60). Agorastocles and Milphio enter (v. 2), discussing their plan. Hanno overhears their mention of two free-born girls stolen from Carthage (961 ff.), and expresses joy (967-70); this immediately suggests his errand to the audience. After considerable fooling between Milphio and Hanno, during which Milphio tries to make an impression with his Punic with no great success, Hanno explains his errand, and they compare the tokens. Agorastocles remarks that he was born in Carthage (1055), and one thing leads to another until it is established that Hanno is a cousin of Agorastocles' mother; Agorastocles is identified positively by an ape bite on his left hand. Thus the first recognition is completed. In the latter part of the scene (1080 ff.)

Milphio suggests using Hanno's help against the leno; he explains briefly the circumstances, and Hanno is again reminded of his own case; in the course of the explanations which follow, which lead to the summoning of the girls' nurse, a second recognition is brought about and Agorastocles' sweetheart and her sister prove to be Hanno's daughters.

The expository technique of the Poenulus, then, may be considered normal; the preliminary exposition is reduced to the bare essentials, but is complete before the action begins; a hint of the recognition occurs early (i. 2); further information is introduced when it becomes necessary for the further development of the action (iv. 2); the remaining presuppositions occur in the recognition proper.

Two Terentian plays,¹ the Andria and the Eunuchus, display, in general, a similar technique; sufficient information is given before the beginning of the action (Eun.), or very shortly after the action begins (And.), to enable the development to be understood; each play contains a sub-plot, and the essential facts concerning it are given upon its introduction rather than in the earlier exposition; the facts which are primarily related to the recognition are deferred until the recognition occurs.

In the Andria a youth is in love with a girl who is pregnant by him, all without his father's knowledge. His father has arranged a marriage for him with a neighbor's daughter, but upon the youth's affair becoming known the engagement was broken off.

¹For a recent survey of the plays of Terence, and the problems involved, see Terzaghi, Prolegomena a Terenzio, Turin, 1931; on Terence's expository technique see Tenny Frank, "Terence's Contribution to Plot-Construction," AJP, XLIX (1928), 309-22 (reprinted with little change in Frank, Life and Literature in the Roman Republic ("Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. VII; Berkeley, 1930), pp. 106-23).

The father, to test his son's obedience, conceals the break and insists upon his son's consent to the marriage. Meanwhile the child is born and this fact is utilized by the young man's slave to cause the engagement, which has meanwhile been renewed, to be broken off a second time. The difficulties are finally resolved by a recognition, in which the youth's sweetheart proves to be the long-lost sister of the girl to whom he was betrothed.

Some years ago (923) Phania, a Rhamnusian (929-30), left Athens to avoid the war and to follow his brother, Chremes (939), into Asia (935); he took with him a child, Pasibula (945), later called Glycerium (cf. 942), Chremes' daughter (932-33), whom, at the time, he was afraid to leave in Athens (936); her father has never heard of either since (936-37). Phania and the child were shipwrecked on the coast of Andros (923-24); since they were destitute he applied first, as it happened, to the father of a girl named Chrysis (924-25); Phania died there (928), previously informing them that he was an Athenian (927, cf. 221-24, 781-82, 883, 860). Glycerium has always been called and considered Chrysis' sister (809, cf. 124); she is, of course, familiar, in general, with the circumstances in regard to her reaching Andros (cf. 221-24).

About three years ago Chrysis came from Andros to Athens, driven to it by poverty and the coldness of her relatives (69-72), or, according to the relatives' version, through the desire of getting riches in Athens discreditably rather than of living creditably with small means in her own country (796-98); Glycerium, who by now was pretty well grown (814), accompanied her (cf. 117 ff.). At first Chrysis made a living by distaff and loom (74-75); later she set up as a meretrix (76-79), and her home became the rendezvous of a number of the young men of Athens (83 ff.), including Pamphilus, the son of Simo (80 ff.), one of Chrysis' neighbors (cf. 70, 105). Pamphilus had previously lived a very ordinary life (48-69). His affections, however, were not involved with Chrysis (88-91), and he conducted himself so circumspectly (91-99) that Chremes (the father of Glycerium--see above), a friend of Simo's from boyhood (538-39), offered his only (so far as he knows, cf. 100, 540) daughter, Philumena, together with a large dowry, as a wife for Pamphilus (99-101); Simo liked the match, accepted it, and the wedding is fixed for today (102). It happens, moreover, that Charinus, a friend of Pamphilus' (326), is in love with Philumena, and anxious to marry her (306, 324); they have had no further relations, however (325-26).

Pamphilus, though, unknown to his father, had fallen in love with Glycerium (cf. 131-36, 145-46, etc.), who was trained and reared in virtue and purity (274, cf. 286-88); he has considered and treated her as his wife (145-46, 271-73); a child is expected soon (215-16, 268) which Pamphilus

has promised to own (219, 400-401, 464); Glycerium extracted this pledge from him, so that she would be sure he would not desert her (401-2); Chrysis, who died a few days after Chremes and Simo had completed their arrangements (104-5), and who had loved Pamphilus as a brother (292), had, upon her deathbed, entrusted Glycerium to his protection, as well as all their property (284-98). By law, however, her property falls to Crito (799), Chrysis' cousin (801), a kinsman of Chrysis' father (926); he is familiar with the circumstances in regard to Phania and Glycerium (cf. 904 ff.), and his arrival at Athens, which he has not visited before (917, cf. 907), to claim Chrysis' property (796-99), leads to the denouement.

Upon the death of Chrysis, Pamphilus was assiduous in helping with the arrangements for the funeral (106 ff.). Simo himself attended (115); there he noticed Glycerium (117 ff.); in the course of the funeral she got too near the pyre and was rescued from being burned by Pamphilus; it was clearly revealed that they were no new lovers (127-36). Next day Chremes came to Simo full of complaint; he had found that Pamphilus regarded Glycerium as his wife (144-46); the two old men parted in such a way that it was evident that Chremes would refuse his daughter's hand (148-49, cf. 241-42). Simo, however, has been acting as if nothing has happened, looking for an excuse for reproving his son (46-47, 149 ff.).

The exposition essential for the first part of the primary plot occurs in the opening scene (i. 1) in the course of Simo's lengthy account of the situation to his freedman, Sosia (protatic), under the pretext of asking his assistance.¹ All the circumstances are given as far as Simo knows them and, with the exception of one fact, the preliminary exposition is complete. The action begins with the second scene (i. 2) in which Simo warns Davus, his son's confidential slave, that he will stand for no trickery. In a monologue (i. 3) after Simo's departure Davus ponders upon his course of action. From his musings we learn that the girl (wife or mistress, he doesn't know which) is with child by Pamphilus (215-16); they have decided to acknowledge any child she may bear as legitimate. Furthermore they have hatched a wild story that the girl

¹Cf. Donat. 28: "haec scaena pro argumenti narratione proponitur, in qua fundamenta fabulae iaciuntur, ut virtute poetae, sine officio prologi vel Θεῶν ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, et periocham comediae populus teneat et agi res magis quam narrari videantur.

is an Athenian born: "Once upon a time there was an old gentleman, an Athenian, a merchant; he was wrecked on the Isle of Andros; he lost his life in the wreck"; the girl was cast ashore, and Chrysis' father took in the poor little orphan (220-24). Davus himself regards this tale as pure fabrication (220, 225); the story, as we see later (iv. 5), is true. This technique, of a statement of facts, with doubt cast upon their verity, occurs elsewhere.¹ The statement here provides, as Frank² phrases it, a "broad hint of the recognition scene." The preliminary exposition is now complete. The technique used here resembles that of the Amphitruo. There the action begins in the middle of the opening scene with the dialogue between Mercury and Sosia, before the exposition is complete; it is completed by the monologue of Mercury which follows (i. 2). In the Andria the division of the preliminary exposition is caused by the necessity of presenting the fact that Glycerium is with child, and at the same time to prevent Simo from learning it.³

The Andria also contains a sub-plot which, we are told by Donatus,⁴ did not occur in the Andria of Menander. As Norwood⁵

¹See note, p. 47.

²AJP, XLIX (1928), 318.

³Another scene may be mentioned which is partially expository, though the information conveyed is relatively unessential; in i. 5 an interview takes place between Pamphilus and Mysis, in which the scene at the death-bed of Chrysis, and her leaving Glycerium as well as all their property to Pamphilus as guardian (282-98), is described.

⁴Donat. 301: "has personas Terentius addidit fabulae--nam non sunt apud Menandrum--ne παρθενικόν fieret Philumenam spretam relinquere sine sponso Pamphilo aliam ducente." We are not particularly concerned in the present discussion with the relation of Terence's Andria to his Greek originals. For a summary of the evidence and a full discussion of variant views, see Fritz Schöll, "Menanders Perinthia in der Andria des Terenz," Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1912, 7. Abhandlung.

⁵Gilbert Norwood, The Art of Terence (Oxford, 1923), pp. 31-32.

has pointed out, this secondary plot is loosely and more or less mechanically attached to the main action. It is introduced upon the entrance of Charinus and his slave Byrrria (ii. 1). The facts which must be introduced are extremely simple: Charinus is in love with Philumena (306 ff., 324); there have been no illicit relations between them (325-26).

The remaining presuppositions in regard to Glycerium are not revealed until the recognition scene (v. 4). Crito arrives from Andros to see about the inheritance which fell to him upon the death of Chrysis (cf. 799). He is led by the circumstances to explain Glycerium's early history, and she is recognized as Chremes' daughter.

We may, then, summarize the technique employed in the Andria by saying that the preliminary exposition is complete before the action gets at all underway, though the action is initiated slightly earlier. The information necessary for the secondary plot is introduced at the same time as the secondary action itself. The presuppositions not given in the early exposition are reserved until the recognition; preparation is made for the recognition by a broad hint early in the play (220-24).

In the Eunuchus a youth is in love with a meretrix who has a freeborn girl, stolen in childhood, under her protection. The youth's brother falls in love with the girl and, with the aid of a slave, substitutes himself for a eunuch who was intended as a present for his brother's mistress. In this guise he ravishes the girl. Meanwhile the girl's brother has been found and a recognition takes place. The ravisher, who claims that his deed was caused by love, is finally forgiven and a betrothal is arranged. The situation in detail follows:

Phaedria, a young man of Athens, is desperately in love with Thais, a meretrix (72, 91-94, 196), who has not lived

in Athens any length of time (cf. 359), and who is without friends or relatives there (147-48). Her mother was a Samian and lived at Rhodes (107). While she was living there, a merchant made her a present of a little girl stolen from Attica (108-10), probably an Athenian by nationality, though they could not be sure (110-11). The girl herself told them the names of her father and mother; from her age she was unable to know her country and the clues that might have led to her identification. The merchant stated further that the pirates who sold her to him said she was stolen from Sunium (111-15). Thais' mother set herself zealously to instruct the little girl and to bring her up as her own daughter (116-17, cf. 748). Most people considered the child as Thais' sister (118). Thais moved to Athens with a gentleman with whom she was then living, the one who left her all that she has (119-20). After a time a Miles, Thraso (cf. 350), who had begun to court her, went off to Caria. Soon afterwards she made Phaedria's acquaintance, and has made him her confidant ever since (125-28). Recently her mother died at Rhodes. Her mother's brother, a covetous man, seeing that the girl was beautiful and a skillful fidicina, hoped that she would fetch a good price and at once put her up at auction and sold her (130-34). Luckily Thraso was present; he bought the girl as a present for Thais, in ignorance of all the circumstances (134-36). He has come to Athens, but finding Thais involved with Phaedria as well, he is feigning excuses for not giving her the girl. He says that if he were confident she would favor him rather than Phaedria he would make her the present (137-42). Thais suspects him of having grown fond of the girl himself (142-43), though this actually is not the case (434-35); she is sure, however, that there has been nothing further (143-44). She thinks that she has already all but discovered the girl's brother, a young man of the highest rank (cf. 952), and he has arranged to pay her a visit today (203-5). She had previously sent word for him to call on her, and had questioned him closely, arousing his suspicions in the process (cf. 507 ff.); he is actually the girl's brother (cf. 914 ff.); his parents have been dead for a considerable time (517-18); he himself has the estate at Sunium (519-20); his sister, if alive, would now be sixteen years old (526-27, cf. 318); he himself is a little younger than Thais (527); an old nurse of his sister's is still alive (808-9).

As the play opens Phaedria is sulking because Thais, through force of circumstances, has refused him admittance the day before (49, 81-83, 96-97). In addition to his previous heavy contributions (cf. 122-23) he yesterday, complying with a request of Thais', had bought her a little Aethiopean slave, and also a eunuch named Dorus (cf. 472), paying twenty minae for the pair (165-69; cf. 984, where Parmeno mentions twenty minae as the price of the eunuch alone). His younger brother, Chaerea, a lad of sixteen (693, cf. 931-33, 986), is, as the play begins, on guard duty at the Piraeus (289-90); since Thais has been their neighbor for a short time only (359) Chaerea has never seen her (360), and no one of Thais' household knows him (374).

Practically all of the essential exposition of the Eunuchus occurs in the opening scenes (i. 1, 2) before the beginning of the action (ii. 1). Phaedria, acting upon Thais' invitation (cf. 46-47), calls upon her. In the course of her explanation as to why it had been necessary for her to refuse him admission yesterday (cf. 81-83, 96-97) she gives a full account of the situation: she relates her affair with the Miles, the early history of the girl she has under her protection, and her desire to find the girl's relatives. In a soliloquy after the departure of Phaedria and Parmeno¹ Thais adds some further information--she thinks she has already all but discovered the girl's brother, who has arranged to pay her a visit today (203-5). This, of course, is a preparation for the recognition which occurs later (cf. iv. 6; v. 3). The action begins with the following scene (ii. 1).

The main plot of the Eunuchus consists of Thais' manipulation of Phaedria and the Miles in order to permit herself to find her ward's brother. In connection with this there is a sub-plot which provides a considerable part of the action of the play. Chaerea, Phaedria's younger brother, has been on duty at the harbor (290). He has seen the girl as she was being taken by Gnatho, the soldier's parasite, to Thais, and has fallen violently in love (293 ff.). In the course of the scene (ii. 3) Parmeno suggests, jokingly (cf. 378), that Chaerea might impersonate the eunuch whom Phaedria is giving to Thais. Chaerea immediately insists upon carrying out the suggestion. Obviously there is only one condition upon which Chaerea can carry out his plan, and that is that no one in Thais' household should be acquainted with him.

¹Donatus comments upon the reason for the use of a soliloquy here (Donat. 197): "recte Thais nunc partem argumenti exsequitur tacitam apud Phaedriam propter praesentiam servi, quem poeta vult ita nescire, ut audeat ad vitiandam virginem subornare Chaeram."

This is definitely stated (374); to increase the probability of this condition, since Thais lives next door, we are informed that Thais has been their neighbor only a short time (359), and that Chaerea has never seen Thais (360), which would suggest that Thais has never seen him.¹ The technique employed here in the matter of the sub-plot is very similar to that used in the case of the secondary plot of the Andria. The secondary plot is, in each instance, introduced after the primary action is underway, and its introduction is brought about by the development of the primary plot. In the Andria the initiation of the second plot is brought about by Byrrhia's meeting with Davus in the forum, and his learning that the marriage between Pamphilus and Philumena has not been broken off after all (And. 301 ff.). In the Eunuchus the sub-plot is initiated by Chaerea's glimpse of the girl as she is being taken to Thais. In each case the necessary expository information is delayed until the introduction of the secondary plot. The exposition of the Eunuchus thus presents no unusual features. The essential preliminary information is given before the action begins; the exposition of the sub-plot is delayed until it becomes necessary; the presuppositions not given in the preliminary exposition occur in the recognition.

The Heauton differs from the two preceding plays mainly in that the facts connected with the sub-plot are given in the course of the exposition of the main plot; the preliminary exposition, which is not complete at the point at which the action begins, is more extensive than that of the Andria or Eunuchus, due

¹This technique is entirely analogous to that employed in the Persa, etc., when characters essential for the carrying on of the action are introduced and facts concerning them are given upon their appearance. The difference here is that Chaerea is not merely a temporary character.

to the fact that the information is presented, to a certain extent, at least, dramatically, rather than simply reported.

The action of the Heauton portrays the stern father, Menedemus, who has driven his son away from home by lack of sympathy with his love-affairs, repenting of his sternness, and his anxiety to make any concessions to win his son back again. Upon the advice of his neighbor, Chremes, who opposes the idea of Menedemus' putting himself entirely at his son's mercy, he acquiesces in allowing himself to be cheated, but in the process Chremes himself is victimized by his own son and his slave. In the course of the action Chremes discovers a long-lost daughter.¹

Chremes' wife, Sostrata, some years ago, bore him a daughter (615, 627-28); he had instructed her that if the child proved to be a girl that she should be exposed (626-27, cf. 634-36). Sostrata gave the child to an old woman from Corinth (629-30), Philtera by name (662), together with a ring (614-15, 650-52); Philtera reported that she had exposed the child (661); actually, however, she kept the child and reared her as her own (96-97, 269-70); she was brought up in virtue (226, cf. 274 ff., 381 ff.), in spite of the avaricious character of the old woman (cf. 233-34), although in abject poverty (96, 285 ff.).

Clinia, the only son (94-95, 540) of Menedemus, fell in love with the girl and was almost as good as married to her, without his father's knowledge (96-98). His father, upon learning the situation, persistently rebuked him, illustrating his point by examples from his own youth (99-112), until finally Clinia, without his father's knowledge, set out for Asia to take service with the king (113-17). When Menedemus learned what his son had done he was overcome with remorse and decided to punish himself; he sold his property in Athens, got rid of most of his servants and, with the proceeds, about fifteen talents (145), bought a farm, where he has been denying himself pleasures and keeping himself steadily at heavy labor (121-50; cf. 60, 67 ff.). His next-door neighbor is Chremes (54) with whom Menedemus has only a slight and recent acquaintance (53 ff.). Chremes' son, Clitipho, and Clinia, however, have been close friends since boyhood (183-84). Clitipho, unknown to his father, is involved with a recently acquired mistress and is embarrassed by lack of funds (223-29). The play opens upon the Dionysia (162) with the return of Clinia from Asia (181-83) after a three months absence

¹For a scene by scene analysis of this play, see Koehler, De Hautontimorumeni Terentianae compositione, Diss. (Lipsiae, 1908), pp. 2-31.

(118). He is still in love with the girl who was the reason for his going abroad (190) and he finds her still faithful to him (265-66, cf. 404 ff.).

The admirable opening scene (i. 1), the conversation between Menedemus and Chremes, gives the general situation from the viewpoint of Menedemus--his son's love-affair, his own strictness toward his son, which resulted in his leaving home, his contrition and his efforts at expiation by giving up his comforts and returning once more to toil (97 ff.). The action really begins with Clitipho's report of the return of Menedemus' son in the following scene (i. 2); the explanation of the whole situation, however, is not yet complete. Clitipho reports that Clinia has returned (180-83), that he is still in love with the mistress who was the cause of his leaving home, and that he is not yet ready to see his father (188-90). In a monologue after his father leaves (ii. 1) Clitipho reveals, in his resentment at his father's precepts, that he himself, without his father's knowledge, has a recently acquired mistress whose demands he has been unable to satisfy (223-24, 229); this information serves to introduce the second phase of the plot, Clitipho's love-affair. Clitipho's comment in the same scene (225-26), that Clinia loves a girl brought up in virtue, acts as a corrective to any false impression which the spectator may have gathered from Menedemus' account of the affair (cf. 97ff.). Clinia appears (ii. 2), and in the course of his anxious conjectures it appears that his sweetheart has been under the control of a wicked mother with no appetite for anything but cash (233-34). In the following scene (ii. 3) Syrus, who had been sent to summon the girl, arrives, and from his report we learn some essential information: Antiphila is still in love with Clinia (265-66); she has remained virtuous during his absence (274 ff.); the old woman who was said to be her mother actually wasn't her mother, and is

now dead (269-71).

Our information in regard to the situation, however, is not yet complete, and it is not completed until the recognition scene (iv. 1). Sostrata has recognized a ring which Antiphila had given her to keep while she went to the bath as one which had been exposed with her daughter (614-17); Chremes had ordered that the child should be exposed, and she gave the child, together with the ring, to an old woman from Corinth, who was to attend to the exposure (626-30, 650-53); the old woman had reported, at the time, that she had exposed the child (661). The action of the rest of the play consists largely of the tricking of Chremes out of funds to pacify his son's mistress, Bacchis.

The Heauton may be considered to possess a gradual type of exposition, in that the action begins before the preliminary exposition is complete. It differs from the Hecyra (see below), however, in that the essential information is given fully before the action is much more than started; the delay in the completion of the exposition is due to the use of the device of the returned traveller; Clinia reaches home after the beginning of the play, and must find out the situation in regard to his sweetheart after his arrival; with the exception of the fact that the action is initiated in i. 2, the technique does not differ materially from that of other plays which use the device of the returning traveller in the early exposition.¹ The facts essential to the second thread of the plot--Clitipho's love-affair--are given early; the two threads of the action are so closely interwoven that neither can be considered as actually subordinate. The withholding of the presuppositions in regard to the recognition until the recognition itself is an example of what we have discovered to be a

¹Cf. especially the Bacchides.

normal type of technique.

In the Phormio we find a considerably more gradual type of exposition. Information is introduced when needed, and the exposition is complete before the recognition. The play depicts the love-affairs of two cousins; one of them, by a fraudulent application of the nearest-of-kin law, has been married before the play begins; his wife is eventually recognized as his own cousin; the other lad is in love with a meretrix, and in the course of the play sufficient funds are extorted from his father and uncle to purchase her from the leno.¹

Demipho and his older brother (63), Chremes, old men of Athens, went abroad at the same time, Chremes to Lemnos, and Demipho to Cilicia (65-67), leaving their sons, Phaedria (son of Chremes [64]) and Antipho (son of Demipho) in charge of Demipho's slave, Geta (71-72, 288). Geta at first tried to check the boys, but after finding his efforts vain he fell in with their whims (75-79). Phaedria at once fell in love with a cithern-player (80-82), who belonged to a leno (cf. 171), but he was able to do nothing except dance attendance upon the girl, in which he was assisted by Geta and Antipho (83-87). One day while they were waiting in a barber shop across the street from the girl's school (88-89) they heard of a very sad affair nearby--a beautiful girl, in extreme poverty, unattended except by a single old woman, was burying her mother (91-100). They decided to attend the funeral, and Antipho fell violently in love with the girl (101-11), whose name was Phanium (201, 218, etc.). The next day he approached the old woman, who informed him that the girl was an Athenian, honest and of honest parents, and refused to let him have anything to do with her unless he married her; he wanted to do so but was afraid of his father (112-18, cf. 153 ff.). A parasite named Phormio (122) suggested that as there was a law that orphans are to be married to their next of kin² (125-26, cf. 415-16), he would swear that Antipho was her nearest kinsman, he would set up for a friend of the girl's father, he would invent corroborative details (cf. 361-67), and they would take the matter to court. As Antipho would not deny anything, the court would order him to marry her (127-34). This was done and they were married (135-36); Phormio claimed in court that Phanium's father, Stilpo (387-89), was a cousin of Demipho's (384); their intention

¹For a complete analysis of the Phormio, see Reidel, "The Dramatic Structure of Terence's Phormio," CW, XI (1917), 25-28.

²The law also provided that as a substitute for marrying the girl the kinsman could supply a dowry of five minae (409-10) and look out for another man as husband for her (296-97).

was, when it should become necessary later to defend themselves, to claim that the cause was right and sure to win, so that it was useless to resist (224-26, cf. 214).

Now it so happens that, unknown to any of the participants in the trial, Phanium is actually the daughter of Chremes (735 ff.). Some fifteen years ago, in his cups, he had had an intrigue with Phanium's mother at Lemnos (1017-18, 873); through fear of his wife he told Phanium's mother that his name was Stilpo (744-46, cf. 585); though he has had no relations with the woman since that time (1018) he has kept in touch with her in the course of frequent trips to Lemnos to collect the rents from his wife's farms there (1012-13, 679-80, 788-91); he has apparently been using part of these rents for the support of the Lemnian and her child (cf. 788-91, 1012-13). His brother, Demipho, is in his confidence, and they had planned to give the daughter to her cousin, Antipho, as his wife (578-82); this had been the reason for Chremes' recent trip to Lemnos (567-68). However, since he had delayed longer than usual in Athens, the mother and daughter, with their household, had set out from Lemnos to join him in Athens (569-72); Chremes himself was detained in Lemnos by illness (573-74), but he learned from the captain of the ship that brought them that they arrived safe (575-76). They had been unable to trace Chremes because of the assumed name (747); accordingly, because of their poverty, and in order to gain time, Sophrona, Phanium's nurse, had suggested the marriage with Antipho (733-34).

Phaedria's affair, meanwhile, has been going poorly because of his lack of funds (144-46); he is in need of thirty minae (557), a sum which, at the beginning of the play, his friends have promised to obtain for him within three days (512-14, 535-36, 703); he had entered into an agreement with the leno to pay him upon a certain day, which has not yet arrived (523-25); meanwhile the leno, who has put up with Phaedria's promises for month after month (520-21), has agreed with a certain Miles to sell him the girl (510); the Miles has promised payment for tomorrow (531-32); the leno, however, is willing to abide by his bargain with Phaedria if he produces the money before the soldier does (532-33).

The exposition proper of the Phormio occurs in the second scene (1. 2). Davus, a protatic character, enters (1. 1) with a short monologue which serves principally to explain his presence, but which is connected with the exposition by his remark (39-40) that he has heard that Geta's master's son has married. Geta enters (1. 2) and in answer to Davus' questions (cf. 57-62) the gen-

eral situation appears.¹ Antipho's marriage and the circumstances surrounding it are explained in detail. Phaedria's predicament is also mentioned, without a great deal of detail.² The action may be said to begin with the following scene (i. 3) although it does not actually get underway until i. 4, in which Geta appears from the harbor with the news that Demipho has returned. i. 3 serves merely for the characterization of Antipho and Phaedria.

At the time when the action begins, however, there is still considerable essential information which is not yet in the possession of the audience, particularly in regard to the primary theme, the marriage of Antipho. Chremes returns from abroad (iv. 1) after the action of the play is well underway, and we learn the reason for his trip, and its results. He had gone to Lemnos in search of his daughter, a child who had resulted from a clandestine affair in Lemnos years ago. He had learned there that the girl, her mother, and her nurse had set out to Athens to look for him, and he learned from the captain of the ship which brought them that they arrived safely. We also learn that Demipho and Chremes had had in mind Antipho's marrying Chremes' daughter (568-82). Thus, with the exception of the identification of Chremes' daughter as the girl whom Antipho actually had married, which occurs in v. 1, the audience is in possession of all the facts. The technique of the Phormio thus differs from that of the recognition plays previously discussed, with the exception of the Cistellaria and the Poemulus, principally in that important presuppositions--

¹It should be noted that while the Phormio contains both a primary and a secondary plot, they are much more closely connected with each other than is the case in the Andria and the Eunuchus. The trick by which the funds desired by Phaedria are obtained (iv. 2 ff.) is organically connected with Phormio's efforts to prevent the marriage of Antipho from being annulled.

²Cf. the Andria and the Eunuchus in which no mention of the secondary theme appears in the preliminary exposition.

the story of Chremes' early affair in Lemnos--are brought in considerably before the actual recognition; the play thus has a more or less gradual type of exposition, brought about by the use of the device of the returning traveller; part of the information given by Chremes upon his arrival--the fact that his daughter had left Lemnos and arrived in Athens, is known only to Chremes,¹ and could not be revealed before his arrival; the rest of Chremes' situation, however, is known to Demipho.²

We have referred to the secondary plot, Phaedria's love-affair, above. Just as is the case in the Andria and the Eunuchus, the facts in regard to it are not presented until they are actually necessary. Then we learn (iii. 2) that the leno has broken a promise to Phaedria, due to Phaedria's failure to keep his pledges, and has arranged to sell his sweetheart to a Miles; Phaedria's friends have agreed to procure funds for him within three days, but as the Miles has promised to pay the leno tomorrow he needs the money immediately (510-32). While Antipho's plight was described in full detail in Geta's account to Davus (i. 2), Phaedria was referred to there only in broad generalities.

Summarizing, then, the exposition of the main plot is gradual, with the essential presuppositions given completely before the recognition; the expository information necessary for the sub-plot is given upon its introduction.

¹Chremes' daughter had known him only under the name of "Stilpo" (cf. 742), and naturally could not know that she was Chremes' daughter.

²The references to the law under which Antipho was married illustrate the gradual type of exposition in the case of minor details. The first mention of the law is that orphans must be married to their next of kin (125-26); some time later we learn a further provision--the next of kin, instead of marrying the orphan, could supply a dowry and look out for a husband for her (296-97); still later we learn that the law specified a dowry of five minae (409-10).

In the Hecyra a youth who had formerly been in love with a meretrix was induced by his father to marry the daughter of a neighbor. During the youth's absence on a business trip an estrangement grew up between her and her mother-in-law for which the latter was blamed, and which culminated in the girl's going home. The youth, upon returning home, finds that the true reason for his wife's departure is that she is about to become a mother. As this is only the seventh month of the union he believes her unfaithful, and though he learns that she had been ravished before her marriage at a festival, he refuses to be reconciled. As the parents of the girl believe the trouble is due to his still being infatuated with his former sweetheart, they send for her. In the course of the interview the mother recognizes a ring which the girl is wearing, given her by the youth, as one formerly belonging to her daughter; this recognition of the ring leads to the discovery that the daughter had actually been ravished by the youth who later became her husband.

Pamphilus, the only (118) son of Laches and Sostrata, had been having a love-affair with Bacchis, a meretrix (114-15, 294); he had even sworn that he would never take a wife in her lifetime (60-62, cf. 99-100); his father had connived at the affair for a long time, hoping that eventually he would get over it (683-85, cf. 744); Pamphilus at last yielded to his father's urging and became engaged to Philumena, the daughter of Phidippus, their nearest neighbor (116-24), and, in spite of his misgivings, of which his slave Parmeno was the sole confidant (130-31, 410), finally married her (125-34), seven months ago (394). He took her home, but did not consummate the marriage for some time (136-56), meanwhile continuing to visit Bacchis (157); she, however, proved more and more unamiable and he gradually realized his wife's virtues and became attached to her (158-70, 294-98, 404, 488-92, 752).

Presently there died at Imbros an old man, Phania, a cousin of Laches (171, 458-59), and by law his property fell to the family. Laches sent Pamphilus, much against his will as a lover, to Imbros (173, cf. 77); his wife was left with his mother (174); Laches himself spends most of his time in the country, principally to save expense (174-75, 215, 224-26). At first Philumena and her mother-in-law got on well together; afterwards the bride apparently conceived a strange dislike for Sostrata and would have

nothing to do with her, and finally pretended her mother had summoned her home to a family ceremony. Sostrata, who had always treated her as her own daughter (279), summoned her after several days, an excuse was made, she sent again several times, but a pretence was made that the girl was ill. Sostrata called but was refused admittance (177-89, 237, cf. 339); the girl's father was anxious for her to return but she refused to go before her husband should return (267-69). Laches heard of the difficulty (189-90, cf. 219), came to town yesterday, called on Phidippus, but received no satisfaction (190-91, 251).

The real reason for Philumena's return home was that she had been outraged ten months ago (822) and had gone home to hide the consequences (382-84, cf. 640); her time is near (392);¹ no one but her mother knows the truth (392); for this reason Myrrhina had opposed her marriage with Pamphilus, ostensibly because of his involvement with Bacchis (538-40). Philumena had not recognized her attacker (who was actually Pamphilus [832]) for it was dark and nothing of his was seized that might lead to identification. He, however, seized a ring from her finger and went off with it (572-74). Pamphilus had arrived at Bacchis' house, just after dark, by himself, out of breath, and far gone in wine, with the ring (822-24); he owned up to having had an adventure in the street with a girl from whom, he said, in a struggle he had pulled off the ring (828-29), which he gave to Bacchis (811-12, cf. 845-46).

The exposition of the Hecyra is characterized by considerable delay in the revelation of certain important phases of the situation, particularly of the real reason for Philumena's return home, and of Pamphilus' adventure at the festival, with a resulting increase in suspense. The facts leading up to the situation at the opening of the play from the view-point of Pamphilus are given in the opening scenes (i. 1, 2). Philotis and Syra (protatic characters), are returning from a call upon Bacchis (i. 1). Philotis remarks that Pamphilus had often solemnly sworn to Bacchis that he would never take a wife in her lifetime, but nevertheless he has taken one (60-63). In the following scene (i. 2) this information is elaborated fully.² Parmeno, slave of Pamphilus, and

¹On the chronology of the stuprum, and of the marriage, cf. Schadewaldt, "Bermerkungen zur Hecyra des Terenz," Hermes, LXVI (1931), 2 ff.

²This opening technique closely resembles that of the Phormio. Davus (protatic) appears with a monologue (i. 1) in the

a friend of Philotis, enters and is teased into relating the story. He, however, is under the general impression that the reason for Philumena's departure from her husband's home is due to dislike of her mother-in-law. The action begins with the second act, which consists of Laches' accusations of his wife as the cause of the estrangement (ii. 1), and the discussion (ii. 2) between Laches and Phidippus, the father of Philumena, of Philumena's attitude. The hint that the general view of Sostrata's responsibility for the situation is wrong is dropped in the course of Sostrata's monologue (ii. 3) in which she insists that she always treated Philumena as her own daughter (cf. 279).

Pamphilus returns at the beginning of Act iii, as much at a loss as the rest. The shrieks of Philumena within (317-18), and Parmeno's report that she had been having something of shivering fits (320-21), would suggest the true state of affairs to the sophisticated spectator. The actual explanation is not made, however, until iii. 3, in which Pamphilus reports in a monologue the result of his interview with Philumena's mother--that Philumena had been outraged and is in the throes of childbirth. Here occurs the first mention of the fact that this is the seventh month of the marriage (394). Not until still later (iv. 1), in a monologue of Myrrhina's, do we learn a detail of the utmost importance for the denouement. This is that the ravisher of her daughter had seized a ring from the girl's finger during the attack and had gone off with it (572-74).¹ Finally, in the denouement itself,

course of which he remarks that he has heard that Geta's master's son has married (39-40). In the following dialogue with Geta (i. 2) this information is supplemented with considerable detail.

¹Schadewaldt, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 ff., considers that 572-74 are an insertion by Terence himself; his grounds for so believing are largely subjective--to his mind the passage does not fit into its immediate context, and (p. 19), "Es ist nicht denkbar, dass ein Dichter der Neuen Komödie, am wenigsten der routiniert Verfas-

we learn the last important fact of the situation, that Pamphilus himself is guilty of the attack which had been made upon his wife.

The result of this technique, then, is that the spectator is kept as much in the dark as the characters themselves, no one of whom knows the whole situation. The facts are revealed gradually throughout the play; not until some time after the beginning of the action do we learn that Philumena is with child; the preparation for the recognition is also gradual; it begins with the disclosure of the attack upon Philumena (382-84); further details, including the theft of the ring, are given later (572-74); the final facts, the tale of Pamphilus' adventure at the festival, occur in the dénouement (811 ff.).¹

An outstanding example of the use of gradual exposition occurs in the one non-recognition play of Terence, the Adelphoe. The true situation is imparted so gradually that the action is well along before the audience is aware of exactly how matters stand. The play shows the outcome of strictness and of laissez-faire in the education of youth.

Demea, advocate of strict discipline, who has lived a toilsome, thrifty life in the country (45-46), married and had two sons. His brother, Micio, who has lived the easy life of town, without a calling (42-43), has never married (44); he adopted Aeschinus, the elder of his brother's boys (47, cf. 40, 114-15), and has brought him up from childhood as his own son (48-49); he has pursued a policy of indulgence with him (50 ff.), and supposes that he shares all his secrets (53-54); the youth has had innumerable and expensive love-affairs (149).

ser der Hecyra, mit so mangelndem dramatischen Taktgefühl gearbeitet hat" But since this information is essential, he concludes that Terence has made considerable change in his original. Schadewaldt's contention is weakened by the consideration that a gradual revelation of essential facts, and preparation for the dénouement, is a frequent technical device.

¹ On the relations between the Hecyra and Menander's Epitrepontes see K. Stavenhagen, "Menanders Epitrepontes und Apollodors Hekyra," Hermes, XLV (1910), 564-82; Ernst Schild, Die dramaturgische Rolle der Sklaven bei Plautus und Terenz, Diss. (Basel, 1917), pp. 66 ff.

It happens that, unknown to either Demea (460 ff.), or to Micio (629-30, 640), although Aeschinus has recently announced to the latter a desire to marry (150-51), that Aeschinus has been having an intrigue with the daughter of Simulus and Sostrata. Simulus is dead (352, 650), and the household, consisting of Sostrata, her daughter, and Canthara, the nurse (288 ff.), is supported solely by the efforts of the slave, Geta (480-82, 932); they are entirely alone with the exception of their nearest relative, Hegio, a poor kinsman of Simulus, with whom he had been brought up (351-52, 494-96, 650-51, 932, 947-48); Simulus, an old man (457), had, upon his death, entrusted his family to the care of Hegio (457-58); Hegio, incidentally, is also a connection and boyhood friend of Demea (438-39). Aeschinus had violently wronged the girl (466-67, cf. 292, 306-8) under the inducements of darkness, passion, wine, and young blood. On realizing what he had done he came of his own accord to the girl's mother, weeping, and swearing to marry the girl. He was forgiven, the matter was hushed up, and his promise was accepted. The girl is with child, and it is now the tenth month (332-34, 470-75, cf. 691, 288 ff.). There has been no payment of money or anything else unbefitting the girl (349); the only witness they have is a ring that Aeschinus had dropped (347); he is a daily visitor (293). The girl naturally has no dowry (340, 728-29, 759).

At the same time Ctesipho, unknown to his father (cf. 81 ff., 93-95, 283, 396-97, 548), has been in love with a girl held by Sannio (cf. 252 ff., 277, 284-85, 589), a leno (161), who had bought her for twenty minae (179, 191). Ctesipho had been almost on the point of fleeing the country (274-75) before his brother found out the situation (272-73). Last night Aeschinus attended a dinner, but instead of returning home (26-27) broke into Sannio's house, beat Sannio, and made off with the girl (88-91, 198-200) on his brother's behalf (261-63); his exploit is the talk of the town (91-93, 328).

The type of exposition employed is described by Terence himself (Prol. 23-24):

senes qui primi venient i partem aperient,
in agendo partem ostendent . . .

The content of the expository first act (i. 1-3) is characterized by Donatus (Ad. 26): "primae partes, sicut in prologo ipse promisit, a senibus aguntur, quorum contentione ad argumentum relata vita aspera cum leni et pater comis cum severissimo comparatur."

Micio appears in the first scene (i. 1) looking for Aeschinus, and his remark that Aeschinus has not returned from the dinner he attended the night before (26-27) immediately suggests an escapade of some sort. Micio proceeds (40 ff.) to characterize

himself and his brother, and states the general situation--he has adopted one of his brother's sons, and has pursued a policy of indulgence in his upbringing. He contrasts his brother's system of discipline as being one of harshness. Demea appears (i. 2) with the report that Aeschimus has broken a door-lock, forced his way into a strange house, beaten the owner and all the household almost to death, and carried off the girl he loved (88-92). The rest of the scene develops into a debate between the two brothers on the subject of their opposing views on the rearing of children, which serves to characterize them further.¹ In a monologue after his brother's exit (i. 3) Micio remarks, apropos of the thought that Aeschimus' love-affairs have been both innumerable and expensive, that recently Aeschimus had announced a desire to marry (150-51). This provides a vague preparation for the announcement of the actual situation some time later.

With the following scene (ii. 1) the action begins.² This scene serves chiefly to present dramatically the report already given by Demea (cf. 88-92); Aeschimus and his slave, Parmeno, appear with Bacchis, followed by Sannio. During the argument which ensues various realistic details appear. Sannio is eventually

¹For a full discussion of the characterization of Micio and Demea, as well as of the characterization of Terence in general, see G. Kenneth Henry, "The Characters of Terence," North Carolina Studies in Philology (1915), pp. 57-78; on Micio and Demea see especially pp. 59 ff.; Siess, "Über den Charakterzeichnung in den Komödien des Terenz," Wiener Studien, XXVIII (1906), 229-62; XXIX (1907), 81-109, 289-320; characterization in both Plautus and Terence is discussed fully in an unpublished Ph. D. dissertation by Ortha L. Wilner, "The Technique of Character Portrayal in Roman Comedy," University of Chicago, 1929; see also Wilner, "Contrast and Repetition as Devices in the Technique of Character Portrayal in Roman Comedy," Class. Phil., XXV (1930), 56-71.

²For the most recent discussion of Act ii of the Adelphoe, especially as to its relation to the Greek original, and for bibliography, see Drexler, "Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens," Philologus, Supplementband XXVI, Heft 2 (Leipzig, 1934), pp. 1-40.

pacified by a promise of reimbursement and leaves. Not until the end of the scene is there the slightest suggestion that Aeschinus is not the girl's lover, and that Ctesipho is not the model son his father (cf. 93-95) supposes him to be; here Syrus remarks (252-53), upon catching sight of Ctesipho,

sed Ctesiphonem video: laetus est
de amica.

In the following scenes (ii. 3-4) we finally learn that Aeschinus has been acting throughout the episode upon his brother's behalf (cf. 252-53, 261-63, 274-75, 277).

With Act iii interest turns upon Aeschinus. Sostrata and the nurse, Canthara, enter, worried about Sostrata's daughter's labor, which is just beginning, and about their friendless condition. From rather indefinite references to Aeschinus (291-93), and to the lover (295 ff.), it is implied that Aeschinus is responsible for the girl's condition. The facts are finally cleared up, as regards the audience, upon the appearance of Geta (iii. 2), who has heard the report of Aeschinus' escapade, and, sharing the general view that Aeschinus has been acting on his own behalf, thinks that he has deserted them. From the dialogue between Geta, Sostrata, and Canthara we learn that Aeschinus had shamefully and violently outraged the girl (306-8), and that he had sworn that he would put his boy in his father's arms and implore his leave to marry her (332-34); the girl has no dowry (345); they have a witness in the ring that Aeschinus had dropped; there has been no payment of money or anything else unbefitting the girl (349). Some slight details regarding the circumstances of Aeschinus' assault upon the girl are given later (iii. 4) in Hegio's report of the affair to Demea (470-75). The balance of the play depicts the reactions of the various characters as they learn the truth, and the adoption by Demea of Micio's philosophy of education which

he proceeds to burlesque.

We may summarize the expository technique somewhat as follows: the exposition proper consists of three scenes (i. 1-3); in these scenes Micio and Demea are introduced and characterized, and their opposing views of education, which form the problem of the play, are stated; the escapade of the stolen girl is reported, which prepares for the following action. The first part of the action (ii. 1-4) demonstrates that Demea is mistaken in his estimate of Ctesipho and wrong in his conception of the success of the policy of strictness; it also clears Aeschinus of the charge of being the lover of the kidnapped girl; the true situation is developed gradually in the course of the action. The second part of the action (iii. 1-4) takes up Aeschinus' predicament and demonstrates that Micio's theory of education has not borne the fruit he expected; the information in regard to Aeschinus and his affair with the daughter of Sostrata is introduced here for the first time, i.e., it is introduced when needed to carry on the action.¹

The Rudens is the outstanding example among the Plautine plays of the use of gradual exposition, both in the setting-forth of the immediate situation as the play opens, and in the presentation of the more remote facts.

In the Rudens a youth is in love with a girl, a prospective meretrix, who is held by a leno; while attempting to steal away secretly with his meretrices to more profitable fields, the leno's ship is wrecked, and he, together with the girls, is washed ashore. In the shipwreck the crepundia, by which the youth's sweetheart hopes eventually to find her parents, are lost. The

¹While, of course, the section devoted to Aeschinus cannot be considered a sub-plot, the technique of introducing the information regarding him is entirely similar to the technique used in introducing a sub-plot; cf. And., Eun., Phor.

girls are befriended by an old gentleman who is living near the spot where they were washed ashore; eventually the old man's slave appears with the crepundia which he had brought in in his net while fishing; in the recognition which follows the old gentleman discovers that he has actually been protecting his long-lost daughter.

Palaestra, only (cf. 106) daughter of Daemones, a free-born Athenian citizen (35, 605, 736-38, 740-41, 1080), and of his wife, Daedalis (1156-64), was lost when she was three years old (39-41, 106-7, 742-44, 1105), and, unknown to her parents (216-16a), was sold to a leno (40-41, 745, passim), Labrax, who brought her to Cyrene (41, 615, 713); she has not yet, however, been a source of profit to him (219). She has preserved in a casket the crepundia she was wearing, by which she hopes to recognize her parents (389-90, 1081-82);¹ she is aware that she is a freeborn Athenian (217, 394, 649, 714, 736-38, 1079, 1104-5).

Plesidippus, a freeborn Athenian of the highest rank, and, unknown to either, a relative of Daemones, who knows Plesidippus' father (1197-98, 1214), is staying in Cyrene (42); he saw Palaestra returning home from music school, fell in love (cf. 351), approached the leno and purchased the girl for thirty minae (42-45); he gave the leno a deposit and bound him by an oath (46, 554-56, 861); Labrax, however, was at the time entertaining an hospes of his, Charmides, of Agrigentum in Sicily (49-50, 451, 495, 883); he persuaded Labrax that there was much greater opportunity for profit in Sicily (51-57, 540-41); accordingly, Labrax hired a ship secretly and loaded his possessions on board by night (57-59, 356-57); then, after telling Plesidippus that he was planning to sacrifice to Venus and inviting him to the prandium (59-62, 94-95, 125, 128-30, 142-43, 325-26, 344, 864-65), he embarked with Charmides and the meretrices (62-63, 356-57, cf. 326) who consisted of Palaestra and Ampelisca, another freeborn girl (649, 714, 736-38). They were well out to sea (66, cf. 267) when a great storm arose (69-71, 83 ff.), the ship was dashed to pieces (73, 354, 365 ff.) and the leno and his guest were washed ashore (72-73, 485 ff.). All their possessions were lost (199, 549-52), including their purses (395-96, 545-48, 1309); Labrax had had a large sum of money (1309, 1313-19), as well as the casket containing Palaestra's crepundia of which he had taken possession (388-96). The girls leaped from the ship into a boat (74-75, 366-70) and, at the opening of the play, are being brought to land near the cottage of Daemones (76-77, 162 ff.), which was damaged by the

¹The crepundia consist of a gold sword inscribed with the name of her father, Daemones, a double-headed gold battleaxe bearing her mother's name, Daedalis, a silver sickle, a windlass, a gold bullae (1156-71).

storm (77-78, 87-88). For Daemones has been living in Cyrene in exile from Athens (35, 77, 615, 741), after losing his honorably acquired property in aiding others (36-38, cf. 126-27, 1234).

Plesidippus, after learning the situation from others (64-65) and after instructing his slave, Trachalio, to meet him at the temple of Venus (306-8), took some friends with him to the harbor (89 ff., 307) but found that the leno had already left (91). He then comes to the temple of Venus to see whether Labrax had actually performed the sacrifice he had mentioned (94-95, 125, 128-30).

The prologue of the Rudens gives a complete account of the presuppositions and of the situation at the opening of the play. All essential information given there is repeated later on in the play. The material not repeated is a matter of realistic detail--the way in which Plesidippus saw Palaestra returning from music-school (42-43) and the detailed description of Charmides' arguments in favor of a trip to Sicily (49-57); more important, perhaps, is the account of the reasons for Daemones' being in exile from Athens (35-38); however, it can be inferred later (126-27) that he is an innocent victim of circumstances; Gripus' remark, late in the play (1234)--Isto tu pauper es, quom nimis sancte pius es--is sufficient explanation.

The play opens (i. 1) with a short monologue by Sceparnio, a slave of Daemones, describing a storm of the night before. Plesidippus enters (i. 2) with some friends and in the course of the conversation some expository information appears: Plesidippus is looking for a leno (91) who with two young women was planning a sacrifice to Venus either yesterday or today (94-95, 125 ff.); Plesidippus had been invited to the prandium (142-43);¹ however,

¹ On the references to the prandium (and to the departure of the leno), see Drexler, "Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens," Philologus, Supplementband XXVI, Heft 2 (1934), pp. 108 ff.; Drexler considers that discrepancies exist, and were to be found in the original; but see Cerf, "An Interpretation of Plautus, Rudens 148-152," PAPA, XXXVII (1906), pp. xl-xli.

no one has sacrificed at the temple for some days (131-33); incidentally we learn (106-7) that Daemones once had an only daughter whom he lost; this provides a hint of the recognition.¹

¹Fraenkel (Plaut. im Plautus, pp. 123 ff.) offers, mit zurückhaltung, the conjecture that Rud. 104-9 does not derive from the Greek original but is a Plautine insertion. His reasons for so believing are that in general the passage does not correspond in tone with its environs, and that it is not in accord with the Unterhaltungsstil der attischen Komödie; in particular he finds difficulty in the fact that Daemones reveals details of his family life to a perfect stranger, and that his seconding the feeble jest of his slave contradicts his general demeanor; Plesidippus' comment (107), at di dabunt, also, according to Fraenkel, can scarcely be understood, since Daemones is past the age when he might expect another daughter (Fraenkel refuses to accept Geppert's suggestion in his edition, Berlin, 1846, that Daemones is referring to the kidnapping of his daughter, and not to her death); thus Plesidippus' hope that Daemones may again be a father is so tactless that it fails to correspond with Plesidippus' customary reserve; the words actually serve merely for the introduction of Scepharnio's prophecy of a magnum malum (108).

Obviously the grounds for Fraenkel's attribution of the passage are decidedly weak. To my mind the jest is not, as Fraenkel thinks, an end in itself (cf. p. 125: "so mehrt er (Plautus) das γελोटον auf Kosten des ηθοσ"), but rather a device to introduce the fact that Daemones had a daughter who was lost, a foreshadowing of the eventual recognition introduced before the first appearance of Palaestra; thus, if we should decide with Fraenkel that the passage is an insertion by Plautus we should be forced to consider it an artistic improvement upon the original rather than an example of Plautine lack of taste, as Fraenkel believes. Fraenkel's rejection of the obvious interpretation that Scepharnio and Daemones here have in mind that the daughter is "lost" and not "lost by death" seems to me perverse. For Scepharnio's jest to have any point at all it must be assumed that both he and Daemones at least admit the possibility of the eventual discovery of the girl; Plesidippus' pious rejoinder, at di dabunt (107), shows clearly that he understands the situation thus; it is entirely unnecessary to assume, as Fraenkel does, that the words represent extreme lack of tact on the part of Plesidippus.

The passage also does not seem to me to conflict particularly with the context; Scepharnio's impertinence is quite consistent with his attitude in the rest of the scene, as well as elsewhere; cf. 99, 115 ff., 140 f.; ii. 4. Furthermore, I see no difficulty in Daemones' giving details of his family life to a stranger, or in "seconding" the jest of Scepharnio; actually Daemones' explanation is a form of apology for the rudeness of his slave, and an amplification of what would otherwise be a particularly pointless remark.

Marx, Rudens (Leipzig, 1928), in his commentary on vss. 104-9, assumes, mainly from the feebleness of the wit, that "v. 104-9 gehören deshalb weder Diphilus noch Plautus, sondern dem Nachdichter, dessen Hand sich v. 108 durch die unplautinische Wortstellung von quisquis es (ebenso unplautinisch Mil. 585) offenbart." Obviously, however, lack of quality in wit cannot be taken as a test of genuineness.

The action begins with the following scene (i. 3) upon the entrance of the shipwrecked Palaestra. We observe, then, that in this play an unusually small amount of expository information is given before the action begins. Palaestra laments her wretched lot and considerable information is suggested: her master's impiety is causing this woe (198); he has lost everything at sea (199); her companion was washed out by the waves (200-201); this place is strange to her (210); her parents do not know of her wretchedness (216-16a); she was born free¹ to no avail for she is in servitude (217-18); she has never profited those who reared her for their own benefit (219).²

In the following scene (i. 4) Ampelisca appears, the girls meet and discover the temple of Venus. Ptolemaecratia, the priestess of Venus, hears them, comes out from the temple (i. 5), and promises to do all she can for them. The next scene (ii. 1) is largely atmosphere; a group of fishermen appear who have come from the city to fish but find the waves too high. Trachalio, Plesidippus' slave, arrives (ii. 2) in search of his master. He makes inquiry of the fishermen, but they have seen no one; he then decides he was right and that the leno has embarked with the women (325-26); this is a slight addition to our information, for we do not learn from Palaestra's lament (i. 3) that she is in

¹For a summary of the references to the free birth of both Palaestra and Ampelisca, and on the discrepancies involved, see Drexler, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 ff.

²This line (219) seems to me to be a statement of Palaestra's virtue, a clear case of "preparation" for the recognition. Harsh, however, in his study of preparation (Philip Whaley Harsh, "Studies in Dramatic 'Preparation' in Roman Comedy," unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Chicago, 1933) does not mention this passage, but, on the other hand, insists that the *Rudens* does not indicate Palaestra's chastity (cf. pp. 44, 48, 52, 53), and since in the *Casina*, as it now stands, he finds no evidence of any preparation (cf. p. 52) he draws rather important conclusions regarding the technique of Diphilus; these conclusions are weakened if *Rud.* 219 actually refers to Palaestra's virtue.

servitude to a leno, although that might be inferred.

In the next scene (ii. 3) Ampelisca comes out of the temple on her way for water; she sees Trachalio and mutual explanations are in order. This scene is important, for it both adds some new facts and summarizes and puts in their proper relationship the facts already suggested.¹ We learn, in brief, that Labrax was attempting to carry off Palaestra and Ampelisca, together with all his possessions, to Sicily; his ship and all their possessions are lost, including the crepundia of Palaestra which the leno had locked up in his wallet; we learn also that Plesidippus is in love with Palaestra (344 ff.).

In ii. 6 Labrax and his guest, Charmides, enter, having escaped safely to land. During their mutual accusations our information is further increased; Labrax was undertaking the trip to Sicily because of the persuasion of Charmides (540-41); they have both lost their purses (545-48); Labrax had received an earnest from Plesidippus for Palaestra (554-56).

In iii. 1 a further essential fact appears; Daemones relates a dream which he had had the night before and which actually foreshadows the action of the play. During his account we learn incidentally that he is a citizen of Attica (604-5); thus another preparation for the denouement is made. We learn for the first time in the following scene (iii. 2) that the action is taking place in Cyrene (615, cf. 740); Daemones, therefore, is not a native of that place.

Meanwhile Labrax and Charmides have discovered (cf. ii. 7) that the young women are in the temple and they have been trying to drag them away. In the dispute which ensues between Labrax and

¹We may compare with this scene Truculentus ii. 4 in which the information previously given is recapitulated and the false impressions suggested earlier are cleared up.

Daemones (iii. 4) Trachalio asserts that the girls should be free since they are from Greece and one of them was born at Athens of free-born parents (736-38); this information that Palaestra is a citizen of Athens is new; heretofore we have only known that she was freeborn. Daemones is led to reveal that he is an Athenian (740-41) and he is reminded of the daughter he had lost when she was three years old--if she is living she must be as tall as Palaestra (742-44); Labrax insists he paid for the girls, wherever they were born (745).

Thus at last our information is fairly complete and all preparations for the recognition are made. The recognition is brought about by the dispute between Trachalio and Gripus, a slave of Daemones', over the ownership of the leno's wallet which Gripus has fished out of the sea; Daemones is called upon to arbitrate the matter and in the process he recognizes the crepundia in the wallet as those belonging to his lost daughter. Incidentally Plesidippus is revealed as a relative of Daemones'.¹

¹Jachmann (Plautinisches und Attisches [Weidmann: Berlin, 1931], pp. 1 ff.) finds difficulty with Rudens 1197-98, in which Daemones announces his purpose "die wiedergefundene Tochter einem edelgeborenen jungen Manne, der aus Athen stamme und mit ihm verwandt sei, zur Frau zu geben. Darin liegt ein Widerspruch zur Anfangsszene des Dramas, wie er scharfer nicht gedacht werden kann (pp.4-5)." He compares 103 ff., 627, 648, all of which show that Daemones and Plesidippus have had no former acquaintanceship. "Seit jenem ersten Zusammentreffen am Anfang des Stückes haben sich Plesidippus und Demones nicht wieder gesehen--woher kommt also diesem die genaue Kenntnis von dem Jüngling, die er V. 1197-98 an den Tag legt? . . . Jene munteren Ausleger freilich, die sich so ungleich besser darauf verstehen, die Intentionen eines Dichters zu erkennen als dieser sie kenntlich zu machen, sie werden gewiss auch hier rasch mit einer Lösung bei der Hand sein, etwa dieser: Trachalio könne ja, als er mit Demones im Hause war, während Gripus draussen seine Betrachtungen (1184-90) anstellt, und in der Pause zwischen IV 4 und IV 5 den Alten über Plesidippus unterrichtet haben. Allein dieser Schleichweg hintenherum ist versperrt, denn von der Verwandtschaft seines Herrn mit Demones ahnte Trachalio selbst nichts, konnte ihm also auch nichts davon verraten. Der vollkommene Widerspruch lässt sich demnach auf keine Weise wegdenken, sondern bleibt in aller Schärfe bestehen (pp.5-6)." He concludes (p.11) that the whole of Daemones' monologue is a Plautine insertion. But from other indications in the play (42, 1218, 1220) he decides that the

The expository technique of the Rudens is obviously unusually artistic, at least from the modern point of view. Facts are introduced gradually throughout the play, often in a very incident-

Greek original had contained a recognition of Plesidippus as a relative of Daemones', and that this recognition took place on the stage; Plautus has therefore omitted at least one scene, and perhaps considerably more, of the original (p. 13).

While it must be admitted that from the analogy of the Poenulus and the Menaechmi, which contain recognitions which are, in general, similar (and which Jachmann does not use for comparison), we might expect this recognition in the Rudens to take place on the stage, nevertheless I wish to protest against Jachmann's conclusion that it is impossible for Plesidippus' relationship to Daemones to be discovered as it is in the present state of the play. In the Poenulus Agorastocles is found to be a relative of Hanno's through Hanno's questions about the youth's parents, which he is led to ask upon finding that Agorastocles was born in Carthage (cf. 1055ff.). Likewise, in the Menaechmi, the fact that the two Menaechmi are brothers is established by the discovery that they are both sons of Moschus of Syracuse (1069ff.). In both these plays the relationship is established by tracing the relationship through the parents of the characters who are recognized. One might expect, then, that in the Rudens the recognition, whether it took place before the audience, or off-stage, would be brought about in somewhat the same way. Daemones, Palaestra, and Trachalio enter the house at 1183, and Daemones reappears at 1191 with the announcement of the recognition. (The shortness of the interval during which Daemones is in the house is unimportant; lack of verisimilitude in this respect is common. Cf. A. Polczyk, De unitatibus et loci et temporis in nova comedia observatis, Diss. (Breslau, 1909), pp. 31ff.; M. Brasse, Quatenus in fabulis Plautinis et loci et temporis unitatibus species veritatis neglegatur, Diss. (Breslau, 1914), pp. 84-91; Conrad, The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy, Diss. (Chicago, 1915), chap. i.) These three characters possess all information necessary for the discovery. Jachmann's remark (p. 6) that "von der Verwandtschaft seines Herrn mit Demones ahnte Trachalio selbst nicht, konnte ihm also auch nichts davon verraten" is entirely beside the point. It was unnecessary for any of the three characters to know of the relationship before they went into the house. One would imagine that one of the first questions of a father (or mother) of a long-lost daughter who has been restored, and who is engaged in a love-affair with a youth who has been putting forth every effort to free her from slavery, would be as to the youth's identity, which would inevitably lead to a mention of his parents. This would be all that is necessary to bring about the recognition, just as it is in the Poenulus. Trachalio, the slave of Plesidippus, as well as Palaestra, would be able to supply all essential information just as well as Plesidippus himself; cf. Marx, Plautus Rudens (Leipzig, 1928), commentary on v. 1197: "Durch Trachalio, der mit Daemones in den Hof eingetreten war, hatte dieser Name, Stand und Heimat des Pleusidippus erfahren und die Verwandtschaft festgestellt." (It might be conjectured that Palaestra already knows that Plesidippus is related to someone named Daemones, though this is not essential. One would certainly not be surprised to learn that she was familiar with some details of her sweetheart's family history. In the Andria Pamphilus (as well as Davus) knows

tal fashion. No more information is given at any one time than is necessary for the understanding of the immediate action; by a succession of hints, however, the preparation for the recognition is made in such a way that by the time the wallet is discovered all the interwoven threads of the situation are visible to the audience; the recognition scene itself adds no new facts. The Rudens is a supreme example of the gradual type of exposition.¹

Glycerium's early history (cf. 220-24), as well as the fact that her childhood name was Pasibula (cf. 946-47); cf. also the Phormio, in which the reference to Stilpo (390) shows a knowledge of Phanion's story.).

In no other of the extant plays of Plautus or Terence is there a recognition which is exactly parallel. But a sketchy treatment of the recognition is not unexampled. In the Captivi, for instance, no details are given as to how Stalagmus was recognized in Elis and brought back. Likewise, in the Truculentus, the details of the double-betrothal of Callicles' daughter are omitted entirely.

¹As we remarked in the introduction to this chapter, it is not our intention to engage in any discussion of the prologues. It is interesting, however, to note the general similarity between the groups into which the plays have fallen in this chapter, and the groups obtained by Leo in his study of the Plautine prologues (Pl. F.², chap. iv). One purpose of this chapter has been to observe where the presuppositions are given; on this basis the plays may be divided into two general groups: (a) plays in which the necessary presuppositions are given completely before the action begins, and (b) plays in which the exposition is not complete at this point. In the first group occur Pers., Asin., Miles., Mer., Pseud., Trin., Bac., Most. In this group may be included the Amph. and Cas., in which the necessary information, while not entirely complete at the technical initiation of the action, is complete early in the play, as well as the Stich., in which the relation of Gelasimus to the brothers is the only fact not explained in the preliminary exposition. The second group includes the remaining Plautine plays, as well as the Terentian. Leo, partly from the analogy of Euripides (cf. pp. 197, 204-5), and partly from an analysis of the Plautine plays, assumes as a definite principle of New Comedy technique that the audience must be put in possession of all the presuppositions before the action begins; thus when this information is not given in the preliminary exposition of the play, a narrative prologue is necessary. He, therefore, in his analyses of the plays, is interested in seeing in what part of the play the necessary facts are given, or, more exactly, whether the exposition is complete before the action begins; he finds this condition fulfilled in the case of the Most. (p. 194), Pers. (p. 195), Stich. (p. 196), Asin. (p. 200), Trin. (p. 201), Cas. (p. 207), Miles (pp. 214-15), Merc. (p. 215), Pseud. (p. 217). It is evident, therefore, that the similarity between the grouping in this chapter and that of Leo is due to a similarity in purpose in the use of the same material, and accordingly has no significance.

II

THE TECHNIQUE OF EXPOSITION IN THE INTRODUCTORY COMPLEX OF SCENES

1. The Structure of the Scenes and the Choice of Characters for Expository Purposes

In the preceding chapter our attention was concentrated primarily upon the presuppositions and their presentation throughout the play. In the present chapter it is our purpose to consider in detail the early scene-complex--the portion of the play commonly designated as the exposition as distinguished from the development and the dénouement. Strictly speaking the exposition extends only up to the beginning of the action. Upon occasion, however, the technical initiation of the action is followed by a scene or scenes which do not advance the action, but serve only for atmospheric background, for characterization, for introduction of characters or for some other purpose which is not actually development.¹ In these cases we have included in our consideration the scenes preceding the point at which the action really gets underway.

Our interest in this and the following chapters will be primarily in the structure and the technique employed rather than upon the information presented. In the early scenes of the play the poet is faced by various problems which either do not occur

¹The *Poemilus* affords an example of this technique. The action must be considered to be initiated with the formation of the plan to trick the leno (163 ff.). The action does not get underway, however, until 410 ff., when Agorastocles and Milphio decide to proceed with their plan. The whole of the second scene (1. 2) is still exposition rather than development.

later, or which, if they do occur, are not so difficult of solution--the choice of expository characters, the motivation of first entrances, and the motivation of the presentation of the preliminary exposition. In the present chapter we shall consider the general structure of the introductory scene-complex, and the choice of expository characters. We shall be interested particularly in any evidences of individuality in technique which may represent the technique of the poet of the Greek original. For that reason we shall consider together plays based upon originals by, or attributed to, the same Greek poet.¹

The three plays whose originals are attributed to Philemon, the Mercator, Mostellaria and Trinummus, particularly the latter two, offer some interesting points of similarity. We shall begin with a brief analysis of the Mostellaria.

The play opens (i. 1) in the midst of a violent quarrel between Grumio (protatic), the country-slave, and Tranio, the city-slave.² Grumio, who perhaps has been forcibly ejected from the kitchen, angrily calls Tranio outside (1-5); Tranio appears, and they engage in mutual abuse in the course of which the general situation appears; it should be noted that it is Grumio, the protatic character, who actually states the expository facts (cf. 11-12, 21, 25, 78-79).³

¹For concise analyses of the exposition of the Plautine plays, see Leo, Plautinische Forschungen², (Berlin, 1912), pp. 194-218.

²On the country-slave vs. the city-slave, see p. 103, n. 3.

³Two other plays, the Casina and the Aulularia, open with a quarrel, in the former between two slaves, in the latter between master and slave; other quarrels occur in early scenes; with the Most. cf. particularly Truc. ii. 2; see also Asin. i. 2, 3; Pseud. ii. 2; Men. i. 2; Hec. ii. 1. On quarrels and arguments in general, see A. Perkmann, "Streitszenen in der griechisch-römischen Komödie," Wiener Studien, XLV (1926-27), 29-47, 202-14; XLVI (1928-29), 68-78, 139-59.

The second scene consists of a topical song by Philolaches which serves principally for characterization, though it does reveal incidentally some relatively unimportant facts (cf. 142, 144-45); the monody consists of an elaborate comparison of a man to a new house (84-132), followed by an application of the comparison to himself (133-56).¹ Philematium and Scapha enter (i. 3) without perceiving Philolaches; they have just come from the bath (157-58), and proceed to put the finishing touches upon Philematium's toilet;² Philolaches, after observing the process for a considerable time, with comments aside, joins the conversation (291). This long scene, like the preceding one, is largely devoted to characterization, but here, also, some expository information appears in an incidental fashion (cf. 190, 204, 206, 300).³ The following scene (i. 4), in which Callidamates and Delphium appear in the hope of a party, is devoted entirely to the portrayal of atmosphere--a dramatic representation of the life of revelry which had been referred to so scathingly by Grumio (cf. i. 1).⁴

In the Mostellaria the poet has a wide range for the choice of expository characters; Theopropides is the only important character who, due to his long absence abroad, is ignorant of the situation; he alone, because of this absence, is not avail-

¹This monologue is analyzed by Leo, Gesch. der Röm. Lit. (Berlin, 1913), pp. 111-13; see also on Trin. ii. 1, below, and p. 97, n. 1.

²On the lack of verisimilitude involved in the playing of this scene on the street, necessitated by the fixed stage-setting, see Brasse, Quatenus in fabulis Plautinis et loci et temporis unitatibus species veritatis neglegatur, Diss. (Breslau, 1914), pp. 58-59.

³An interest in realistic detail is evidenced by the entirely unessential information included--that Scapha, e.g., had been deserted by her lover; Philematium is beloved by other men (231), but she is keeping herself for Philolaches alone (190, 216-17).

⁴On other atmospheric scenes, see p. 125, n. 3.

able for the preliminary exposition. It is particularly interesting to note, therefore, that a protatic character is introduced for expository purposes; as we observed above, it is Grumio who actually states the situation, rather than Tranio. The careful depiction of his character--the faithful, virtuous countryman shocked by the excesses committed in his master's absence, makes it probable that the poet here was interested in character-painting for its own sake. In addition the fact that there would be little reason for the giving of the circumstances by a character in the play may have had some influence upon the selection of a character who lies outside the action. At any rate the dialogue between the slaves provides a lively and realistic opening scene.

The Trinummus opens with a short topical discourse by Megaronides (i. 1) in which, after announcing his intention of reproving his friend for a grievous fault (25-27), he philosophizes upon the necessity of reproof as the duty of a friend; as he ponders upon the morals of the times (28 ff.) Callicles enters (i. 2), addressing his wife within the house as he does so (39-41).¹ He observes Megaronides, and, after mutual greetings, the latter brings up the purpose of his coming (65 ff.), and accuses Callicles of betrayal of a trust; Callicles, in defending himself, is led to give a complete account of the situation (106 ff.), and of the presuppositions of the play; upon his exit (198) Megaronides indulges in a second topical discourse upon the evil propensities of busybodies, and then leaves for his home (cf. 191).

¹ This device of bringing on a character who, as he enters, talks to someone within the house, is stereotyped; for typical examples see Bac. 179 ff., Cas. 144 ff., 165 ff., Curc. 223 ff., Stich. 58 ff., Phor. 51, Hec. 76 ff.; cf. also Epitr. 213-14, 548-50, Peri. 61, 176-77, Samia 86-88; for a complete list of passages see Ernst Schild, Die dramaturgische Rolle der Sklaven bei Plautus und Terenz, Diss. (Basel, 1917), p. 10, n. 6.

In the following scene (ii. 1) Lysiteles appears with a topical song upon the choice of the proper career which bears considerable resemblance to that of Philolaches in the corresponding position in the Mostellaria (i. 2). His mind is troubled (Trin. 223 ff.), just as is Philolaches' (Most. 84 ff.); he has been pondering upon the comparative advantages of the life of love and of the life of aggrandisement (227 ff.); Philolaches, for his part, has been attempting to find a proper comparison for the life of a man, and has hit upon the idea of a house (Most. 84 ff.); Lysiteles proceeds to develop the theme of the pursuits of love (235 ff.), with great emphasis upon the evil results; he concludes, in complacent self-satisfaction, that he will avoid love, and devote himself to advancing himself in life (266-70); he speaks briefly of the labor involved in an upright life, and of its advantages (271 ff.). Philolaches, in turn, develops the comparison between a man and a house, at considerable length (91-132); he then applies the comparison to himself, and includes an elaborate description of his own character (133 ff.); as we observed above, some expository details are introduced; the monologue of Lysiteles, on the other hand, introduces no information whatever; it is also not so definitely characterizing as that of Philolaches; the similarities of the two monologues, however, are striking.¹ Philto,

¹The similarities between these two topical songs are not very significant; the device of a topical song by an adulescens is too stereotyped and too widely distributed to be important as evidence for authorship; of the eleven young lovers who make their first appearance in the plays with monologue eight are introduced by topical discourses, or include discussion of a topos in their soliloquies. Charinus of the Mercator (i. 1) includes in his prologue a discussion of the theme of the evils following in the train of love (16-39), and brands his discourse as typical of lovers (16). Toxilus of the Persa (i. 1) sings briefly on the theme of the difficulties of a lover with an empty purse, and states his own predicament. Diniarchus (Truc. i. 1) discourses on the length of the course in the school of love (22 ff.), and the expense involved in its pursuit (30 ff.), and eventually dis-

father of Lysiteles, appears in the next scene looking for his son (276), in compliance with a previous request for an interview (cf. 324). The scene is largely devoted to characterization, but some essential information is introduced (cf. 326 ff., 374-75).¹

Aside from the similarity between the monologues of the adulescentes discussed above, and a corresponding tendency toward gradual introduction of information, there are other details of technique common to the two plays which are worthy of notice. Neither the entrance of Philolaches (Most. i. 2), nor that of Lysiteles (Trin. ii. 1), is definitely motivated. Philolaches may possibly be considered to have come on to await Philematium, as it is evident from the following scene (cf. 166-67, 248-49)

cusses his own case (77 ff.). The action in the Cistellaria is introduced by the appearance of Alcesimarchus (ii. 1) who believes that it was Love who first developed the torturer's profession--it is his own experience which leads him to this conclusion; he lists the various tortures of love, and includes, at the end (225-28), some slight exposition. Mnesilochus (Bac. iii. 2) enters quite satisfied with life. He has carefully considered the question (385; for similar formulae see Most. 84-89, Trin. 223-27), and has concluded that nothing but Heaven exceeds a real friend; in explaining how he has found this true in his own experience he includes some exposition. Ctesipho (Ad. ii. 3) enters with the statement of a theme which he does not, however, develop to any extent--to get something when you want it is a real joy, but to make the joy complete the favor must come from the right person; it is his brother he has in mind. We may also mention Ctesipho of the Heauton, who is introduced in a dialogue scene with his father (i. 2); in the following scene (ii. 1), however, he discourses in an angry monologue upon the theme of what unfair judges of young men fathers are; some exposition is introduced.

The topical song is one of the most frequently employed devices in comedy; it consists of a statement and development of a general theme with an application to the speaker; it is used for a variety of purposes; for examples of the employment of topical songs in the exposition, aside from those mentioned above, see Amph. 163-75, Cas. 217-27, Cist. 22-41, Pers. 7-12, Rud. 189-97, Truc. 97-111, 210-55. On topoi cf. Leo, Der Monolog im Drama (1908), pp. 75-78; Bickford, The Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy, Diss. (Princeton, 1922), pp. 7 ff.; A. Perkmann, "τόποι in der griechisch-römischen Komödie," Mitteilungen des Vereines klassischer Philologen in Wien, VI (1929), 59-74

¹ Thus in the Trinummus, just as in the Mostellaria, we notice a tendency toward a gradual revelation of expository information within the exposition itself.

that she is adorning herself for his eyes. But the motivation certainly is not emphasized. Similarly Lysiteles (Trin. ii. 1) appears without explaining his entrance; in the following scene (ii. 2) we learn that he had requested an interview with his father (324-25); but, as in the Mostellaria, this motivation, if such it is, is far from definite. The appearance of Callicles (Trin. i. 2) is also entirely unmotivated. In the Mostellaria the motivation of the appearance of Philematium and Scapha (i. 3) is vague; we gather that Philematium is getting ready for Philolaches (cf. 166-67, 248-49), but no reason is advanced for their appearance upon the street;¹ in the same way, in the Trinummus, Lysiteles' interview with his father upon the street (ii. 2) is poorly motivated, though the reason for Philto's appearance is sufficiently explained (cf. 276, 324).

There is considerable resemblance also in the motivation of the giving of information in the main expository scenes (Trin. i. 2, Most. i. 1). In the Trinummus Callicles' account of the situation is brought about by Megaronides' reproof of his supposed misconduct. In the Mostellaria the motivation is also reproof, this time an angry one: Grumio, in detailing Tranio's misdeeds, reveals the essentials of the situation.² While Megaronides, in the Trinummus, is not a protatic character, he does not play an outstandingly important part in the rest of the play (see iii. 3 for his only appearance later); his function in the opening scene is closely analogous to that of the protatic Grumio in the Mostellaria; both opening scenes, the dialogue of the two slaves in the

¹ On the staging of scenes properly belonging to the interior of the house, see Dalman, De aedibus scaenicis comoediae novae ("Klassisch-Philologische Studien," herausgegeben von Christian Jensen, Heft 3; Leipzig, 1929), pp. 36 ff.

² Reproof is also used, Most. i. 2; i. 3.

Mostellaria, and the dialogue of the senes in the Trinummus, are highly natural and well motivated.¹

The poet is strictly limited, in the Trinummus, in his choice of expository characters. Callicles alone is familiar with all the facts. The general circumstances are a matter of common knowledge, as is shown by Megaronides' familiarity with them (98-125), but the essential fact, that Charmides had left a treasure in Callicles' charge for safe-keeping, to be used as a marriage-portion for his daughter in case he did not return (149-59), is known to Callicles alone, as well as his own motive in buying Charmides' house when the son put it up at auction. By the conditions of the plot, then, Callicles is the only one who can be used to reveal the true situation. Megaronides is made possible as a listener by the fact that he is outside the action proper.

The third play from an original by Philemon, the Mercator, has a much simpler exposition, consisting of two scenes (i. 1, 2). The first (i. 1), a prologue spoken by Charinus, gives the presuppositions and the present situation as far as Charinus knows it. The second scene (i. 2) presents the situation as it is understood by his father. We may also include in the discussion here the following scene (ii. 1), a monologue by Demipho, which technically begins the action, but which actually does not advance it.²

The prologue by Charinus, disregarding the announcement of the play (9-10), differs little in structure from the monologues

¹On the general similarity between the Most. and Trin., see Leo, "Lectiones Plautinae," Hermes, XVIII (1883), p. 561; Gesch. der Röm. Lit., pp. 110 ff.

²There is evident here the same tendency toward a gradual revelation of information which we observed in the Mostellaria and Trinummus--Charinus gives the presuppositions (i. 1), Acanthio adds additional facts of the present situation (i. 2); Demipho repeats this information, and foreshadows the action of the play in his description of his dream of the previous night (i. 3).

of the adulescentes of the Mostellaria (i. 2) and the Trinummus (ii. 1). Charinus, first of all, desires to acquaint the audience with both the argument of the play and his own passion (1-2); Philolaches, in the Mostellaria, desires to acquaint his listeners with his line of reasoning, that they may be as well-informed as he is (99-100). Charinus, following the announcement of the author and the play (9-10), begins his narrative of the presuppositions, only to break off with an apology for his failure to follow the practice of lovers in developing the theme of love (16 ff.); he proceeds to describe, in a topical discourse, the symptoms of the man in love, and applies them to himself; his account of the evils following in the train of the emotion bears a certain resemblance to Lysiteles' discussion of the same theme (Trin. ii. 1). With vs. 40 Charinus returns to his account of the presuppositions, and gives them with great detail; in this respect the monologue contrasts sharply with those of the Mostellaria and Trinummus which, as we have observed, contain little (Most.) or no (Trin.) strictly expository material.

In the following scene (i. 2) Acanthio, slave of Charinus, appears in a great hurry from the harbor to report to his master the recent developments there. The scene presents features of the situation unknown to Charinus, and completes the necessary orientation of the audience; it begins with a servus currens monologue¹ by Acanthio, interspersed with wondering asides by Charinus

¹The monologue of the servus currens is stereotyped both in form and content. The slave is regularly represented as being in a fearful hurry to find someone, usually his master, to report news, either good or bad. The characteristics of this type of monologue, and its usual function, are given by the pseudo-slave, Mercury, in the Amphitruo (iii. 4); he enters driving passers-by, who are probably imaginary, right and left (984-85), warning them not to hinder him, nam mihi quidem hercle qui minus liceat deo minitarius populo, ni decedat mihi, quam servolo in comoediis? Ille navem salvam munit aut irati adventum senis. . . . A monologue of this variety is used frequently to get the action started;

(cf. 120-21, 123, etc.), whom Acanthio has not observed, and continues until Charinus finally steps forward and addresses him (133). Repartee follows until Acanthio at last begins his report (161) with the announcement that he is bringing bad news from the harbor (161, 163); his account is interrupted by further repartee which extends to vs. 180, after which, urged on by Charinus' eager questions, Acanthio relates the occurrences on board the ship.

Demipho, father of Charinus, whose appearance we were led to expect in the previous scene (cf. 219, 222-23), enters (11. 1) after the exit of Charinus and Acanthio; he relates a dream of his of the night before, and tells of his visit to the ship--a tale which simply repeats the information we have already learned in the previous scene (1. 2); the scene introduces Demipho, characterizes him to a certain degree and, by means of the dream, suggests the action of the play. His monologue is really a topical discourse¹ on the theme that the gods make sport of mortals in amazing ways (225); he illustrates his point, and applies the general principle to himself, by relating the amazing dream he had the night before (226 ff.); he is in doubt as to what the dream foretells, but he thinks he has already discovered what part of it means (252-54); to explain this he relates his experiences of the morning, and repeats the facts already given by Acanthio.

At the point at which the play begins the two characters who are familiar with the situation as it affects Charinus are

cf. Asin. 267 ff., Epid. 192 ff. (a burlesque), Most. 348 ff., Stich. 274 ff., Phor. 179 ff. For other examples of this type of monologue, occurring after the exposition, see Capt. 768 ff. (parasite), Curc. 280 ff. (parasite), Trin. 1008 ff., And. 338 ff., Ad. 299 ff. Cf. Weissmann, De servi currentis persona apud comicos Romanos (Gissae, 1911); Legrand, Daos (1910), pp. 429 ff.; Schild, op. cit., pp. 56 ff.

¹It is interesting to observe that the six monologues occurring in the exposition of the three plays of Philemon all consist of, or include, topical discourses.

Charinus and Acanthio.¹ But Acanthio is needed for the following scene to bring word from the harbor that Demipho has seen the girl, so that Charinus remains as the only available character for the preliminary exposition. The situation as regards Demipho is given in Acanthio's report (i. 2). The reason for the use of a report here, even though the information is repeated by Demipho himself upon his appearance (ii. 1), is obvious--the development of the action demands that Charinus be informed of the fact that his father has seen the girl and become infatuated with her; at the same time Demipho wishes to conceal this from his son, and therefore cannot be used to reveal it to him directly.

We shall consider next the two plays from originals by Diphilus, the Casina and the Rudens. As we have observed above,² both plays are characterized by a gradual revelation of information.

The Casina opens (i. 1) with a lively quarrel between the two slaves, Olympio and Chalinus.³ Olympio, who has come out of

¹Later (481) we find that Eutyclus, a friend of Charinus', had been told the whole story yesterday. This is obviously a convenient device for the avoidance of repetition of facts already known to the audience; the closest parallel to this passage is Pers. 116 ff.; here Saturio had also been told the situation yesterday (see p. 143, n. 2); there are numerous cases where a character has been told the situation just before his entrance; see Cist. 631 ff., Epid. 104 ff., Miles 874 ff., Pers. 333 ff., Pseud. 694 ff., Trin. 729 ff., Ad. 447 ff.

²See pp. 30 ff., 84 ff.

³It is interesting to note that in this scene there is no attempt to differentiate the country-slave, Olympio, from the city-slave, Chalinus, in the matter of characterization; this is in contrast with the two other quarrels between a country-slave and a city-slave which occur in the comedies (Most. 1. 1; Truc. ii. 2). In the Mostellaria Grumio, who has come in from the farm, is sharply distinguished from the dissolute, devil-may-care Tranio, as the embodiment of the rural virtues and of faithfulness to his absent master. In the Truculentus Astaphium, Phronesium's pert, deceitful maid, interviews Truculentus, the surly country-man, whose uprightness, devotion to his master, and disgust with the meretrices are emphasized; the similarity in characterization to that of Grumio is marked. It must be noted, however, that Truculentus falls from grace later on in the play (iii. 2). All three scenes are used to present presuppositions of the action.

the house to talk over, and think over, his affairs by himself (89-90), had been followed by Chalinus, who suspects treachery (91 ff.); they throw up to each other their intentions regarding Casina, and in so doing provide some necessary exposition (cf. 94-96, 98, 102, 108) in an artistic fashion--facts are dropped casually in the midst of mutual abuse, and any appearance of a purpose of acquainting the audience with the facts is avoided.¹ After their exit Cleostrata and her maid, Pardalisca, appear (ii. 1), with Cleostrata giving instructions to servants within as she does so, and announcing her intention of calling on her neighbor (144-46); Pardalisca remarks that the master had given instructions that lunch should be ready for him (147); she is abruptly dismissed (148), and Cleostrata vents her annoyance in a short monologue, in which she incidentally characterizes her husband, and remarks that he is opposing her and their son to satisfy his own amorous appetite (cf. 151-54); just as she is leaving to tell her neighbor how unhappy she is (160) she sees her coming out (161-62). Myrrhina appears (ii. 2), speaking to her servants within, just as Cleostrata did upon her entrance in the previous scene, and, in turn, tells them that she will be at Cleostrata's, if anyone should ask for her (166).² Cleostrata addresses her (171), and dialogue begins; Myrrhina inquires the reason for Cleostrata's doleful appearance (172-73) and the latter continues the tirade against her husband begun in the previous scene, incidentally amplifies information given previously, and thus still further clears up the situation (193 ff., cf. 150). Myrrhina advises Cleostrata against taking any too radical steps against her

¹For other opening quarrels see note 3, p. 94.

²For other cases of this formula see Stich. 66-67; Phor. 51; Hec. 76-77.

own interests; they see Lysidamus approaching (213), and Myrrhina leaves hurriedly (216).

Lysidamus enters (ii. 3)¹ with a topical song (217-27), serving entirely for characterization,

. . . . on the Spice of Love. The old lover enters in smug self-approval, reeking and dripping with perfumes. After a general statement that marks his mood as one of amorous exaltation (217-8) he develops the theme in connection with the science of cooking (219-20). He extols the excellence of this spice (221-23). These terms he then applies to himself, by implication (224-5). Then he cites the effect his love for Casina has had on him--he has begun to patronize all the perfumers (226-7). . . . Result: the dotting old lover stands revealed in all his complacent folly, a picture completed by that muttered tirade at sight of his wife which is followed at once by sugary addresses to her.²

The Casina is somewhat unusual in that all the characters at the opening of the play, with the exception of Myrrhina and Chalinus,³ presumably are familiar with the entire situation, but no one character is chosen to reveal the situation, as is the case, e.g., in the Mostellaria and the Phormio. All take part in the various expository scenes, and the facts are imparted gradually. Olympio and Chalinus (i. 1) reveal only that each intends to marry Casina. Cleostrata (ii. 2), in dialogue with her neighbor Myrrhina, explains the situation more fully, showing that Lysidamus is backing Olympio. In the following scene (ii. 3) we learn further that Cleostrata is supporting Charinus on behalf of her son (262-63). Thus finally we have the whole situation. The facts that each character reveals are largely determined by what he wishes to conceal. Thus in the scene between Olympio and Chalinus (i. 1) nei-

¹ Preparation for the appearance of Lysidamus is made earlier; cf. 147.

² Ortha L. Wilner, "The Technique of Character Portrayal in Roman Comedy," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation (University of Chicago, 1929), pp. 117-18.

³ Chalinus is not aware that Lysidamus is infatuated with Casina; cf. 469-70.

ther could be expected to reveal that he is acting on behalf of another. Lysidamus, though he reveals, in his entrance monologue (217-27), that he is in love with Casina, in the rest of the scene tries to conceal the fact. Cleostrata is the only character with any motive for revealing that she is helping her son.

As the Rudens opens Sceparnio, slave of Daemones, enters with a short monologue (83-88) upon, and inspired by the sight of, the storm of the night before; in the midst of his soliloquy Plesidippus enters (i. 2), talking to friends who are accompanying him (89-95); from his remarks we learn only that they have been at the harbor looking for a leno whom they were unable to find (90-91), and that they have come to the shrine of Venus where the leno had been intending to sacrifice (94-95). Daemones comes out, calling Sceparnio, and proceeds to give him instructions in regard to repairing the damage caused by the storm (100 ff.); Plesidippus advances and greets Daemones and Sceparnio (103); after some repartee (104 ff.) resulting from the impudence of Sceparnio, in the course of which one expository fact appears quite incidentally (106-7), Plesidippus inquires of Daemones whether he has seen the leno (124 ff.); again some information appears incidentally (127, 142-43). They see some shipwrecked people swimming ashore (148 ff.); Plesidippus and his friends leave (159), while Daemones and Sceparnio watch the efforts of the victims to reach shore (164 ff.); Daemones, however, instructing Sceparnio to mind his own business (181-83), drags him away before their fate is decided.

Palaestra enters (i. 3) with a topical song upon Underserved Misfortune;¹ the action must be considered to begin with her appearance, though this scene serves merely to introduce the

¹Cf. Wilner, op. cit., p. 120.

heroine, and to provide some further exposition (cf. 198-201, 210, 216-19); it may be compared with Casina ii. 3; there Lysidamus enters with a self-characterizing topical song, which, in contrast to Palaestra's solo, contains no exposition with the exception of the fact that Lysidamus loves Casina (225), a fact which has already been presented to the audience (cf. 193-95a). Aside from the similarity between these two scenes in structure, position, and function, the most outstanding resemblance in technique between the Casina and Rudens lies in the very gradual imparting of expository information even in the early scene complexes; there are, in other words, no obviously expository scenes giving all, or at least most, of the necessary facts, as we observe elsewhere; there is also a marked resemblance in the motivation of exposition; facts are dropped incidentally, or are brought in indirectly, so that the audience almost imperceptibly becomes aware of the situation.

By the conditions of the action of the Rudens the choice of characters for the exposition at the point at which the play opens is limited--Palaestra, Ampelisca, Labrax and Charmides, who are aware of the circumstances, have not yet reached shore. The only remaining characters are Plesidippus and his slave Trachalio; Plesidippus, the interested character, is chosen.

In a third group we shall include plays on originals by, or attributed to, Menander. We shall examine first the four plays of Terence whose originals are definitely established, the Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton, and Adelphoe.

The preliminary exposition of the Andria is confined to the opening scene, a dialogue between Simo and his freedman, Sosia (protatic);¹ they, with other attendants, are returning from a

¹On dialogues between servus and senex, see Schild, op. cit., pp. 14 ff.

marketing expedition (28); Simo detains Sosia outdoors for a few words; the latter is expecting instructions in regard to the preparations for the wedding (30, 47), but Simo explains that he wishes, instead, to make use of other qualities he has always observed in him--his fidelity and secrecy (32 ff.).¹ With this introduction, and after reminding Sosia of his former kindnesses toward him (35 ff.), Simo proceeds to explain with great detail the present situation and conditions leading up to it; his narrative is artfully told, with considerably more detail than is actually required to present the situation, but which effectively enhances the atmospheric background.²

¹One is struck by the mechanical role of the protatic Sosia in this scene; while his presence is motivated (cf. 28 f.), and while Simo justifies his narration of the presuppositions to him by asking his assistance in counterfeiting the wedding preparations and in keeping an eye upon Pamphilus and Davus (168 ff.), nevertheless no effort is made to account for his complete ignorance of Pamphilus' previous activities, which have been the talk of the town (cf. 96-98); moreover, he apparently has not even heard of the Andrian, who has lived nearby for three years (70ff.), much less of her recent death (cf. 105-6); this ignorance is the more suprising in view of his confidential relations with Simo, and in the light of Davus' familiarity with the situation (*passim*). This lack of motivation may, with considerable probability, be charged to the account of Terence himself (cf. Donat. *ad And.* 14, and p. 157, n. 1). The closest parallel to Sosia's improbable ignorance is perhaps to be found in the opening scene of the *Curculio* (see p. 152). A certain lack of plausibility also occurs in the *Eunuchus* (i. 2); Thais relates to Phaedria events which occurred before she became acquainted with him (cf. 126-27), and recent developments which, one must presume, have occurred since Phaedria has last seen her (cf. 81-83, 137-38); it is explicitly stated that she has treated him as a confidant (127-28), and one might reasonably expect him to be familiar with some of the facts presented. As a usual thing, care is taken to render the listener's ignorance plausible; Chremes (*Heaut.* i. 1), for example, has had no dealings with Menedemus (cf. 53 ff.), and thus naturally enough has not heard his tale, especially since Menedemus has lived in the city up to three months ago (cf. 118 ff.); in the *Hecyra* (i. 2) Philotis has been away from Athens for two years (cf. 85-87), so that her ignorance of conditions is justified. For other examples see under the motivated question, pp. 147 ff.

²A feature of this expository scene worthy of note is the artificial character of the dialogue, particularly during Simo's narrative (46 ff.); in all essentials his account of the presuppositions is a monologue, broken only by infrequent inane comments by Sosia (cf. 54, 60-61, 74, etc.). One-sided dialogues of this

The action is initiated by the entrance of Davus, the son's confidential slave (i. 2), and Simo's warning to him that he will not endure any trickery, and that the marriage must come off as planned. In the soliloquy of Davus which follows (206-27) the further essential fact is revealed that Glycerium is with child (215-16); Davus reports also the fallacia which the lovers have hatched up--that Glycerium's father, an Athenian merchant, was wrecked on the Isle of Andros, that he lost his life in the wreck, that Glycerium was cast ashore, and was taken in by Chrysis' father (220-24). This tale later on proves to be true, and thus foreshadows the denouement.¹

The choice of Simo to explain the situation here is probably determined by the necessity of making clear his intention of proceeding as if the proposed match had not been broken off in order to find an excuse for reprimanding his son; Simo, in the main, is playing a lone hand throughout the play opposed by everyone else, and the play is dominated by his determination to bring about the marriage of his son; thus it is important that his attitude be made clear at the start. If a monologue is to be avoided,

general type in scenes devoted to preliminary exposition are practically confined to the Terentian plays; long narratives giving the presuppositions are found in the expositions of all the plays with the exception of the *Adelphoe*. In Plautus similar long narratives are almost entirely lacking; the only real example is to be found in the *Curculio* (ii. 3) in which Curculio, upon his arrival home from abroad, relates his experiences; a long narrative here, in the form of a report, is perfectly natural. The Plautine dialogue is regularly characterized by a rapid exchange of remarks, and long speeches by one character are quite exceptional; instances are the drunken speech of the Lena, *Cist.* 22-45, the philosophizing of Demaenetus, *Asin.* 64-83, and the tirade of Grumio, *Most.* 15-33.

¹ The mechanics of this scene-complex resemble those of the *Amphitruo*. There, after an initial expository scene (1-292) the action begins with the dialogue between Sosia and Mercury (293-462); then Mercury, in a short monologue, gives some further important presuppositions, and suggests the outcome of the play. Cf. note 3, p. 137.

the choice of a protatic character as a listener, rather than an interested character in the play, is necessary, otherwise the deception in which Simo intends to indulge would become common knowledge.¹

As the Heauton opens we find Menedemus at work in the field. His neighbor, Chremes, has come to tender a reproof; he admonishes Menedemus for working so hard (53-74), and eventually induces him to tell his story.² His account, like that of Simo's in the Andria, takes the form of a long narrative (97 ff.), broken only by Chremes' question and comment in the middle (118 ff.).³ At the conclusion of his tale Chremes invites him to dine with him, but Menedemus refuses, and leaves; Chremes, in a short soliloquy (167-73), expresses his sorrow for Menedemus. He calls for his neighbor Phania, whom he has invited to dinner, but finds that he is already at his house (168-72);⁴ Simo is just leaving for home when he observes someone coming out of his house, and steps aside (173-74).⁵

¹On the protatic Sosia, see pp. 156-57.

²For similar expository dialogues between senes, see Trin. 1. 2; Ad. 1. 2.

³On long narrative speeches see note 2, p. 108.

⁴On this absence of Chremes' from the stage as an indication of a chorus in the original by Menander, see Skutsch, Hermes, XLVII (1912), 141-45 (= Kl. Schriften, pp. 480 ff.); Flickinger, "XOPOY in Terence's Heauton, etc.," Class. Phil., VII (1913), 24 ff.; Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches (Berlin, 1931), pp. 245 ff. (opposing Skutsch).

⁵Norwood (The Art of Terence [Oxford, 1923], p. 43) comments on this scene as follows: "As in the Andria one notes the admirably written explanatory speeches: that of Menedemus (121-50) where he tells how he gave up his comforts and began to toil once more in expiation to his lost son. . . Both these narratives are marked by a tone of domestic intimacy--the slaves pulling off old Menedemus' shoes when he comes home. . . . Better than all this is the unobtrusive and absolute mastery of the opening scene, where the two elderly neighbors stand amid the farm-implements chatting with unforced charm and point concerning life and its perplexities for old fathers of wayward sons."

This scene bears a rather close resemblance to the beginning of the Trinummus (see above, p. 96). There Megaronides enters

The action of the Heauton is initiated by the entrance of Chremes' son, Clitipho, who appears speaking to Clinia within (175-77); he observes his father, for whom he is looking (179), informs him that Menedemus' son, Clinia, is within, and reports in some detail his situation and intentions; Chremes characteristically offers criticism and admonition, and goes within. Clitipho thereupon, in a soliloquy (11. 1) motivated by his resentment at his father's admonitions, contrasts his father's advice with his alcoholic tales of his youth, and in considering how little effect his father's words have, reveals that he himself has a recently acquired mistress of extravagant tastes, of whom his father has not yet learned. Clinia (11. 2) comes out of the house with a short monologue (230-34), motivated by his worry about his mistress. Clitipho addresses him, and attempts to calm his anxiety. Syrus and Dromo, who had been sent to find Clinia's mistress, appear (11. 3) on their way back, talking together as they enter; Clitipho and Clinia, as yet unobserved, listen and

with a short monologue (1. 1) in which he announces his intention of reproving his friend, Callicles, for a grievous fault (25-27); the latter enters, and in showing that Megaronides' reproof is unjust clarifies the whole situation; in the Heauton Chremes also assumes the role of monitor, and his admonition leads to an explanation; there is a certain difference in the motivations, however. Megaronides, in the Trinummus, is concerned for the reputation of his best friend (94, 98-103); he is hurt by what he is forced to regard as that friend's moral dereliction (cf. 46-47, 72-76, 98-103). In the Heauton the motivation springs directly from the character of Chremes, and the use of the motivation, in turn, serves to characterize him; Menedemus is practically an entire stranger to Chremes (53 ff.), yet the latter's familiarity with all the details of his neighbor's daily life portrays vividly his curiosity, a curiosity which Menedemus justly resents (cf. 75-76), and which Chremes complacently admits (77); thus Chremes' interference is that of a busybody.

Aside from this motivation of exposition there is a similarity between the two plays in the reactions of both Megaronides and Chremes at the ends of the scenes; Megaronides leaves "in chastened self-censure at having believed and acted on the malicious reports of gossip (Trin. 199-204). This is the same kind of reversal as Chremes in the Heauton experiences" (Wilner, op. cit., p. 90). The latter's attitude is changed from one of censure to one of sympathetic sorrow (cf. 167-68); in both plays this

comment; noticing that they have outdistanced their companions, Dromo starts back to hurry them up, Syrus talks to himself momentarily (254-56), then sees the youths, and dialogue begins. Syrus, to correct the false impression which Clinia has gathered from the overheard conversation (cf. 263 ff.), gives a complete resumé of their discovery of Antiphila (269 ff.); the intrigue really gets underway with Syrus' explanation of his plan in the latter part of the scene (309 ff.).

Thus the presuppositions--the more remote circumstances--are given in the opening scene, before the beginning of the action; following the technical initiation of the action (i. 2) several scenes are devoted to the presentation of phases of the present situation which are unknown to Menedemus and Chremes. The choice of Menedemus to give the presuppositions is probably due to the necessity of making his disposition clear at the start, since the action of the play, in large part, depends upon his abject desire to do anything his son wishes (cf., e.g., 464 ff.); of the characters of the play he alone is aware of his complete surrender to the desire of pleasing his son. Chremes is made possible as the recipient of this information by the fact that he becomes an ally of Menedemus in the action which follows. Clitipho reveals his own situation, which he has kept to himself; the rest of the circumstances appear as they are learned by the interested characters (ii. 2); the choice of expository characters is thus, to a certain extent at least, dictated by the structure of the plot.

The Eunuchus opens upon a dialogue between Phaedria (adulescens) and his slave Parmeno; Phaedria is pondering upon his proper course of action--whether he is to put up with his mistress'

change of attitude is expressed in a soliloquy after the exit of the other character.

insults or not--and has practically decided to have nothing more to do with her (46-49); Parmeno, who is acting as a Job's comfort-er, commends his decision, but is not convinced that Phaedria has sufficient will-power to hold to his resolution (50 ff.).¹ In the midst of their discussion Thais appears from the house, not seeing Phaedria and Parmeno, with a brief monologue (81-83)--she is afraid Phaedria is offended because she refused him admittance yesterday. Phaedria and Parmeno exchange comments (83-85); Thais overhears them speaking (86) and addresses them;² Phaedria makes it clear that he is offended, and Thais, in defending herself, explains her actions and tells her story from the beginning, interrupted by the pert comments of Parmeno, and carried along by an occasional question of Phaedria's; she eventually succeeds in pacifying the latter, who sends Parmeno to deliver to her the gifts he has for her (cf. 189); Phaedria himself leaves for the country (cf. 188).³ Thais, in a short monologue (197-206) after their exit,⁴ is troubled because she is not sure that Phaedria trusts her; she also reveals that she thinks she may have already discovered her ward's brother; she is expecting a visit from him⁵

¹The slow tempo of the opening scene (cf. particularly Parmeno's long philosophical discourse (50-70)) contrasts sharply with other opening dialogues between similar pairs of characters; cf. Curc. i. 1; Poen. i. 1; Pseud. i. 1.

²This device of an entering character overhearing the voice of someone already on the stage, commenting upon it, and then discovering the character or characters who spoke, is common; cf. Amph. 325; Capt. 133; Curc. 113, 229; Rud. 97; Stich. 88; Trin. 45; cf. also Epitr. 170.

³On the lack of verisimilitude in this scene, see note on the Andria, p. 108.

⁴Cf. Donatus ad Eun. 197: "recte Thais nunc partem argumenti exsequitur tacitam apud Phaedriam propter praesentiam servi, quem poeta vult ita nescire, ut audeat ad vitiandam virginem subornare Chaeream.

⁵There are some interesting similarities between the Eunuchus and the Truculentus, which has also been attributed to Menander. In each play the girl is plotting against a Miles, whose mistress she has been (Eun. 125; Truc. 391-93); in each she

(203 ff.).

The conditions of the Eunuchus allow the poet no choice of expository characters. Only one person, Thais, is familiar with the facts, and hence available for the preliminary exposition. Phaedria and Parmeno necessarily are introduced as listeners, as the initiation of the action depends upon their knowledge of the situation.

The Adelphoe opens with a monologue by the senex, Micio, who appears (i. 1) calling "Storax" (26); upon receiving no reply he concludes that neither Aeschinus, nor his escort came home last night after dinner (26 ff.). His worry motivates his soliloquy; he ponders upon the anxieties suffered by parents, which leads to the thought that Aeschinus is actually his brother's elder son, whom he has adopted (40 ff.); he characterizes his brother and himself, and states and contrasts the principles followed by himself and his brother in bringing up children.

His soliloquy is interrupted by the arrival of his brother, Demea, who enters in a temper (i. 2) looking for Micio. He reports Aeschinus' latest exploit (88 ff.), and blames Micio for Aeschinus' misdeeds (96-97); Micio defends himself, and tries to calm Demea, in which he is partially successful; the latter eventually leaves, washing his hands of responsibility for Aeschinus (cf. 134, 138 ff.);¹ after his departure Micio, in a short soliloquy, reveals that, in spite of the attitude he had assumed before Demea, he is worried about Aeschinus' actions. He leaves

is also loved by a youth, whom she has made her confidant (Eun. 126-28, Truc. 388); each youth is to remain in the background until the Miles is disposed of (Eun. 150-52, Truc. 417-18), after which each is promised a return to first place in the girl's affections (Eun. 150 ff., Truc. 421-22); in each play the youth sends gifts (cf. Eun. 163 ff., 189, Truc. 443 ff.).

¹This scene is largely illustrative; cf. p. 134, n. 1.

for the Forum. The action begins directly with the following scene (ii. 1), upon the entrance of Aeschimus and Sannio.¹

The choice of expository characters here is largely inevitable. Since the play is really a study of the opposing theories of education advocated by Micio and Demes, it is essential that their characters and philosophies should be set forth at the outset of the play. This could not be done with the same effectiveness by any other characters of the play.

In the case of the Plautine plays which have been attributed to Menander, there are none in which the identification is absolutely certain; attribution is made with varying degrees of probability.

The attribution of the Stichus to Menander is practically sure. The play opens (i. 1) with a dialogue between the two wives, Panegyris and Pamphila; they lament their sad lot, and in the course of their discussion of their difficulties various essential facts appear (cf. 3a-4, 14-17, 29-32). Antipho comes out of the house (i. 2) addressing his slaves within, giving them threatening orders about their duties during his absence.² While his daughters continue their conversation (68 ff.) Antipho, in a soliloquy (75-87) considers how he should broach his purpose to them, and reveals that he does not care to arouse too much opposition (cf. 81 ff.). He advances to go into his older daughter's house, but Pamphila overhears him speaking (88),³ and the girls go to meet him (cf. 89). At length, after discussing what type of woman makes the best wife, Antipho brings the conversation

¹See p. 134, n. 1.

²This technique of instructions to servants within by an entering character is common; cf. Cas. 144-46, 163-66, Miles 156 ff., Truc. 95 ff., Hec. 76 ff., Phor. 51; cf. also Samia 86-88.

³See p. 113, n. 2.

around to the subject which he really came to discuss, their coming home and arranging new marriages (128 ff.).¹ His daughters refuse the proposition, and Antipho leaves (146); Pamphila also goes home (146-47); Panegyris calls to Crocotium within to go and summon Gelasimus, the parasite; she then goes into the house.

Gelasimus enters (1. 3) with a parasite-solo (155-233); he thinks that Fames must have been his mother, and plays with the idea at length (155-70); he then states his name, and his father's reasons for choosing it (171-80); he glances at the good old days when invitations to meals were frequent, in contrast to present conditions (181-92); he decides to hold an auction of himself (193-95). At this point Crocotium enters, sees Gelasimus, and decides to listen before announcing her presence (196-97). Gelasimus continues with his reasons for holding an auction (198-216), to the amusement of Crocotium (cf. 217); he then auctions off his attributes to an imaginary audience (218-33) before observing Crocotium (237).² Crocotium summons him to her mistress,

¹The discussion in the early part of the scene (58-125/26) is elaborately analyzed by A. Perkmann, "Streitszenen in der griechisch-römischen Komödie," Wiener Studien, XLV (1926/27), 202-4.

²For other parasite-solos see Capt. 1. 1; iii. 1; Men. 1. 1; Pers. 1. 2; Eun. 11. 2. All have certain elements in common, though details vary. Gelasimus, above, first names his parentage, then his name and the reason for it. Ergasilus (Capt. 69 ff.) and Peniculus (Men. 77 ff.) begin by telling their names or nicknames and how they acquired them. Saturio (Pers. 53-61) omits his own name, but explains that he is following the profession of his ancestors, states the family cognomen and the reason for it; Gnatho (Eun. 264) introduces his name at the end of his discussion. Each then develops his discourse in his own way; each, of course, lays the chief emphasis upon food. Gelasimus laments the change from the good old days, outlines his present state, and holds an auction of himself. Ergasilus glances at the hard life of parasites in general, particularly when their patrons are away (Capt. 77-90), considers his own case, and in doing so reveals some of the presuppositions (91-100)--the only parasite-solo which touches upon the presuppositions; he then characterizes his patron, Philopolemus, and Hegio (102-7), and announces his intention of visiting the latter; a second solo, describing his unsuccessful day, appears later (iii. 1). Peniculus discusses the power of food and drink to bind a man to his patron (Men. 79-95), announces

and Gelasimus, in a short monologue before he sees Pinacium approaching, wonders at his invitation (266-69). The action begins with the entrance of Pinacium (ii. 1).

The characters available for exposition in the Stichus are the two wives and Antipho, all of whom are utilized. Epignomus and Pamphilippus, according to the plot, have not yet returned from abroad; Gelasimus is eliminated, as his connection with the family has been severed since his patrons left (cf. 267-68). Panegyris and Pamphila, naturally, are chosen to reveal their reactions to the situation (i. 1), and the few essential facts are introduced incidentally. Antipho is brought on (i. 2) to reveal his attitude and we learn some details unknown to his daughters (cf. 81-82, 128); thus both sides of the controversy are presented.¹

At the point at which the Bacchides in its present state

himself as bound to Menaechmus (96-97), and characterizes him (98 ff.). Saturio, after his discussion of his ancestry, digresses abruptly and discusses informers (Pers. 62-76). Gnatho begins his solo with a reflection upon the difference between a fool and a man with brains (Eun. 232-33), and remarks that his reflection is inspired by a recent meeting with a brother parasite who has fallen upon evil days (233-36); he repeats their conversation (237 ff.), which had consisted of his lecturing upon his own successful methods, and which resulted in his taking on his acquaintance as a disciple (261 ff.). A similar discussion of the profession, this time in dialogue, occurs in Phor. ii. 2. On parasite-solos in general, see Fraenkel, De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae, Diss. (Gottingae, 1912), pp. 73 ff.

¹According to 56, 75 ff., 127 f., Antipho has not yet actually broached the subject of divorce to his daughters; Langen, Plaut. Studien (Berlin, 1886), p. 215, concludes, therefore, that the sisters perhaps have learned of their father's purpose through the mediation of a friend who was in Antipho's confidence, and that the poet has neglected to give us this necessary information. We cannot be sure that vs. 56 belonged to the original version, as 48-57 and 1-47 are apparently variant versions of the same opening scene; Sedgwick, "The Cantica of Plautus," CR, XXXIX (1925), 56, n. 1, suggests that, contrary to the usual view that 48-57 are a substitute written when Plautus' lyrics were no longer understood (cf. Leo, "Über den Stichus des Plautus," Nach. Gött. Gesell., Phil.-hist. Kl. (1902), p. 378), the lyrics were substituted later by Plautus for the original iambs of this early play, at a time when he had made such lyric scenes popular.

begins¹ Bacchis and her sister are talking together, apparently making plans to ensnare Pistoclerus, who, in an aside (39), expresses some alarm. He addresses the girls (40), and the rest of the scene consists of dialogue between the sisters and Pistoclerus, with the Soror taking little part in the conversation. Pistoclerus is urged to assist the Soror (42 ff.), and is promised the favors of Bacchis in return (47 ff.); in the course of explaining how Pistoclerus can be of assistance, Bacchis reveals a good bit of the situation (cf. 42-43, 45-46, 60, 94); Pistoclerus at last leaves (100) to purchase provisions for a dinner, and the girls, before they go within, comment upon their success.

In the following scene (i. 2) Pistoclerus returns with the provisions which he had left to get in the previous scene, followed by Lydus, his paedagogus; the latter addresses Pistoclerus and is considerably shocked upon learning of the youth's destination; he attempts to reprove him, without much success. The scene characterizes both Pistoclerus and Lydus without advancing the action, and ends with the entrance of both into the house of Bacchis.² Their exit is followed by the entrance of Chrysalus

¹See above, pp. 18 ff.

²In the preliminary exposition of a large number of the plays scenes occur which contain no information about the presuppositions, or the situation as the play opens, or which, if they do present information, simply repeat facts already given. The function of these scenes, aside from that of the introduction of characters, varies: some are devoted principally to characterization; others are what we may term atmospheric scenes, presenting the general background rather than specific information; others are obviously intended for amusement only; still others illustrate dramatically the situation as it has already been described; these functions, of course, are by no means mutually exclusive, and one scene may combine two or more of them; usually, though, one is predominant; at least some characterization is to be found in practically all.

The scene above (Bac. i. 2) falls in the first group; the very amusing dialogue characterizes both Pistoclerus and Lydus, and introduces the latter for the part he is to play later on in the play. Similarly comedy is combined with characterization in Miles i. 1, in which Pyrgopolinices is presented with the aid of

(ii. 1), slave of Mnesilochus, who, together with his master, has just returned from abroad; he enters with a greeting to his master's native land (170-71), and to Apollo (172 ff.); his prayer provides some further information.¹ Pistoclerus comes out of the house of Bacchis (ii. 2), talking to her within as he does so; after mutual greetings Chrysalus inquires what Pistoclerus has done about the commission which Mnesilochus had entrusted to him; this leads to a review of the situation, involving some repetition of information already revealed; at the end of the scene Chrysalus assumes charge of the proceedings (227), and in a short monologue after the exit of Pistoclerus, which bridges the time from Pistoclerus' exit to the entrance of Nicobulus (ii. 3), Chrysalus reveals that they have brought back funds from Ephesus, and that he plans to transfer some of them to his young master (229 ff.).

In the Bacchides two phases of the situation must be presented--the situation at home and the developments abroad--and this necessity affects the choice of expository characters. The first phase appears in the present opening scene, in which all the characters appear who are familiar with the facts. Chrysalus arrives from abroad (ii. 1), and in the following scene (ii. 2) reveals the facts in regard to Mnesilochus and his trip; Mnesilochus and he alone are familiar with this part of the situation. Mnesilochus, however, is not available for this dialogue with

the protatic Artotrogus (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², pp. 213-14). Antipho and Phaedria (Phor. i. 3) are characterized by their dialogue; the action is not advanced, and no facts are added to the exposition. The solo of Philolaches (Most. i. 2) serves only to display his character (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 194). In the following scene (Most. i. 3) Philematium and her maid Scapha are delineated in the famous toilet-scene; a comedy element is provided by the eavesdropping Philolaches and his comments.

¹ On this motivation, see below, p. 176.

Pistoclerus, as the first part of the development depends upon Mnesilochus' belief that Pistoclerus has betrayed his trust. This could not happen if he had met Pistoclerus at once.

The Cistellaria begins with an exchange of compliments between Selenium and her luncheon guests, Gymnasium and the Lena (1 ff.); the Lena, who is somewhat under the influence of the luncheon wine (cf. 120-22), indulges in a topical song upon the necessity of people in their walk of life supporting one another (22 ff.), and in her defense of their actions reveals some facts of their present situation (38-41);¹ Gymnasium comments upon Selenium's doleful appearance, Selenium is induced to tell her troubles, and we learn important presuppositions (69 ff.); at the end of the scene Selenium leaves to visit her mother, while Gymnasium goes inside to take charge in her absence.² The Lena remains on the stage (1. 2) and delivers a drunken monologue to the audience, in which she gives further presuppositions, and clears up the situation by giving certain facts unknown to Selenium; she then leaves for home. Upon her exit Auxilium appears in a deferred prologue (1. 3) and gives a full account of the presuppositions and the situation; there is considerable repetition of information already presented, with the addition of further facts not known to the Lena. The action begins with the next scene upon the appearance of Alcesimarchus (11. 1).

The exposition of the Cistellaria provides a statement of the more remote presuppositions as well as of the present situa-

¹On topical songs see p. 97, n. 1.

²The Cistellaria resembles the Miles in having a deferred prologue; in the opening scene the picture of the life of meretrices enhances the atmosphere of the piece (cf. Leo, Pl. F.2, p. 212); it differs from the opening scene of the Miles in presenting a number of facts of the situation; Miles 1. 1 serves solely for characterization and comedy (cf. ibid., pp. 213-14); deferred prologues in Greek comedy are listed by Jensen, p. xxxiii, n. 1.

tion. The latter appears in the explanation given by Selenium in the opening scene. The choice of Selenium for this exposition is somewhat arbitrary, as Alcesimarchus, naturally, is aware of the whole situation, with the exception of Selenium's decision to go home; he, however, has been kept at the farm for the last six days (225-26), and as the poet does not have him arrive until ii. 1, he is unavailable as the play opens; Melaenis, Selenium's so-called mother, is also aware of the circumstances of Selenium's love-affair (cf. 83 ff.). The remote presuppositions, given by the Lena, are also known to Melaenis, so that here again a choice was made. Here, as frequently, the poet apparently was influenced in his choice of characters by a desire for an effective opening scene.

The Aulularia opens (i. 1) with a lively dialogue scene between Euclio and his slave Staphyla; he drives her violently out of the house, accusing her of spying on him (cf. 41, 53 ff.);¹ the first two scenes are largely used for the characterization of Euclio, though essential exposition is also introduced. The way in which these facts are brought in is interesting: Euclio in an aside (60-66) reveals his fear that Staphyla may find his hidden gold; in a short monologue covering the time during which Euclio makes a hurried trip into the house to make sure his gold is safe (65-66), the worried Staphyla laments that Euclio's daughter is in disgrace, that her time is near, and that she doesn't know how the matter is to be concealed (74-76). Euclio returns (i. 2) from inside the house and continues his vituperation; he sends Staphyla inside with orders not to let anyone in (81 ff.); after her exit (104) Euclio, in a monologue, with a further reference to his gold (110), explains that he must go to the Forum, and

¹For other quarrels in the exposition, see p. 94, n. 3.

leaves.

The characters of the Aulularia who are aware of the essential facts, and are thus able to present them in the preliminary exposition, are strictly limited. The fact of the possession of the pot of gold is known to Euclio alone; the fact that his daughter is with child is known only to Staphyla and Lyconides; Staphyla is chosen as the expository character, probably for the sake of the lively scene with Euclio, particularly as Lyconides is not desired for the early action of the play; he does not appear until quite late (682).

The Poenulus opens with dialogue between Agorastocles (adulescens) and his slave Milphio.¹ After considerable persiflage² Agorastocles asks Milphio's assistance in his love affair, and necessarily explains the circumstances, very briefly, however. Milphio offers his help, and announces a plan for outdoing the leno;³ Agorastocles goes within to arrange matters; in a brief monologue Milphio characterizes both his master and the leno (197 ff.); he sees Adelphasium and Anterastylis coming out (203), and summons his master (205-6). The girls are on their way to the temple of Venus. Upon their entrance (1. 2) Adelphasium is comparing a woman and a ship in the matter of equipment; she applies the comparison to their own case (216) and describes the elaborate toilet which they have just completed.⁴ Anterastylis rather objects to her sister's opinions (233 ff.); Agorastocles

¹For similar opening scenes cf. Curc. 1. 1; Pseud. 1. 1; Eun. 1. 1.

²Somewhat similar persiflage between adulescens and slave occurs, Peri. 77 ff., a scene intended for the amusement of the audience (cf. Jensen, p. xxxv).

³The action technically begins with the formation of this plan; see above, pp. 58 f.; the rest of this scene, however, as well as 1. 2, does not advance the action; see p. 125, n. 3.

⁴Cf. Most. 1. 3; Truc. 322 ff.

and Milphio comment in asides; the girls continue their conversation, and Agorastocles and Milphio their comments, until the girls decide to proceed (329), when Agorastocles addresses them; he receives a cold reception, and is reminded of his failings (359-63); finally, however, he is assured another chance, and the girls leave for the temple. Agorastocles and Milphio, left alone (1.3), decide to proceed with their plan, and the action gets underway.¹

The facts in the Poenulus are a matter of general knowledge to all the important characters appearing in the early development. As a result the choice of Agorastocles to give the preliminary exposition in the first scene may perhaps be considered as due to the fact that he is the only character who has any motive for giving the information. He desires Milphio's assistance in obtaining his sweetheart, and his request for help justifies his calling Milphio's attention to facts with which the latter is partially, if not entirely (cf. 156), familiar.²

The Curculio begins with a dialogue between Palinurus and his master, Phaedromus,³ who are on their way for a call upon the latter's sweetheart. The situation is revealed, as far as Phaedromus knows it, by his answers to Palinurus' questions (cf. 3, 15, 32, 39, 43-47, etc.).⁴ At length Phaedromus explains that there is a multibiba atque merobiba old woman (76-77), Leaena, who has charge of the leno's door; he proceeds to summon her by sprinkling

¹Similar scene-complexes (except for the technical initiation of the action here in i. 1) are found in the Asinaria, Mercator, Pseudolus, Phormio, and Hecyra; the formula consists of (a) an expository dialogue, (b) a scene devoted to characterization or atmosphere which does not advance the action, and (c) the beginning of the action.

²On the motivation of this scene see below, p. 157.

³For similar opening scenes, cf. Poen. i. 1; Pseud. i. 1; Eun. i. 1.

⁴On the motivation of these questions, see p. 108, n. 1; see also pp. 151 f.

wine on the door-step (88 ff.). Leaena appears (i. 2) in a very amusing fashion in search of the wine she has smelled, and is sent back in to summon her mistress (140-40a); Phaedromus sings a paraclausithyron (147 ff.) until she reappears with Planesium. With the entrance of the latter (i. 3) the scene develops into a burlesque love-scene with Palinurus as spectator.¹ At last they hear the doors of the temple of Aesculapius nearby being opened (203 ff.), and Planesium returns within (213); Phaedromus and Palinurus leave directly.²

Cappadox, the leno, appears (ii. 1) from the temple lamenting his physical condition. Palinurus comes out of the house of Phaedromus, addressing encouragement to Phaedromus within as he does so (223 ff.); he and Cappadox recognize each other, and conversation begins; Cappadox details his symptoms, and mentions a dream which he had had during the night; Palinurus offers to interpret it, but at this moment the Cocus comes out (ii. 2) of the house to set Palinurus to work³ and takes over the job of interpreting the leno's dream; alarmed by the interpretation, Cappadox returns into the temple, and the cook goes back into the house.

¹ The only scene in the exposition at all comparable is Most. 293 ff.

² This scene (i. 3) serves chiefly for atmosphere, and for the introduction of Planesium. There is no new information introduced--the only reference to facts occurs in vss. 206-7, and is a repetition of information already given (cf. 67-68).

³ The cook in the Samia makes a strikingly similar entrance (142 ff.). He appears looking for the slave Parmenon, and complains that the latter has not helped him at all (142-44). Demeas, who has worked himself up into a violent mood, dashes past the cook into the house; the latter is astonished, comments upon Demeas' action, and decides to stand aside (153). In the present condition of the play we cannot determine what further part he played in the action, but his appearance here seems quite as unessential as that of the cook in the Curculio. Jensen (p. xlii) considers that the purpose of the poet in bringing on the cook was to avoid a vacant stage, as well as to amuse the spectators.

Palinurus reappears,¹ sees Curculio approaching, and summons Phaedromus. Curculio, not observing Phaedromus and Palinurus, enters (ii. 3) with a servus-currens monologue (280-98); Phaedromus and Palinurus comment upon his speech (299 ff.); they address Curculio (303), and after being assured that food will be provided he reports the result of his trip to Caria (328 ff.);² following his account a plan of action is decided upon, and all go into the house to start operations.³

The characters who are familiar with the facts in the Curculio are quite limited in number. The only characters available, as the play opens, who know the facts are Phaedromus and Planesium. Phaedromus is chosen, probably for the sake of the amusing scene with Palinurus (i. 1); Phaedromus is also the only character who knows that Curculio has been sent to Caria to raise

¹The description of the action given here is based upon the arrangement given in Lindsay's text. There is considerable doubt as to just what the original assignment of lines was. For a full discussion of the question, and for bibl., see Conrad, "The Role of the Cook in Plautus' Curculio," Class. Phil., XIII (1918), 389-400. Conrad argues convincingly that Palinurus, after his exit in vs. 257, does not reappear, and that the Cocus was introduced for the scene with Cappadox in order to permit the actor who played the rôle of Palinurus to reappear as Curculio in ii. 3.

²On the form of this narrative see p. 108, n. 2.

³This elaborate exposition bears a considerable resemblance to that of the Mostellaria. In each play the opening dialogue scene is devoted to presenting the situation. And in each play the scenes which follow (Most. i. 2, 3, 4; Curc. i. 2, 3; ii. 1, 2) neither advance the action nor add any further facts, but, in general, provide background; the atmosphere of dissipation is common to both. In both plays the action is got underway by the arrival of a returning traveller.

Characterization and atmosphere are also combined in Poen. i. 2, in which the life of meretrices appears as background (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 209; Fraenkel, Plaut. im Plautus (Berlin, 1922), p. 275). The Ballio scene of the Pseudolus (i. 2) depicts life in the establishment of a leno (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 216). Capt. i. 2, the scene between Hegio and Ergasilus, scarcely advances the action, but introduces Hegio and establishes the mood of the play (cf. ibid., p. 203). Menaechmus' customary mode of life appears in the early scenes of the Menaechmi (i. 2, 3; cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 205).

money. The second phase of the situation, the happening in Caria, of course must be revealed by Curculio upon his return home.

The Truculentus opens (i. 1) with a topical song on the subject of the Length of the Course in the School of Love, and the financial ruin it brings upon lovers, sung by the adulescens, Diniarchus.¹ He develops the theme at considerable length, with emphasis upon the grasping natures of meretrices and lenones, finally turns to his own case (77 ff.), and tells of his relations with Phronesium and her present attempt at exploiting a Babylonian Miles who is enamored of her. Astaphium, Phronesium's maid, enters (i. 2), counselling the servants within as she does so to keep a close watch upon the household possessions (95-98); this leads to the thought of the difficulties experienced by meretrices in preventing depredations by their patrons, and she develops the theme in a topical song (98-112); she recalls her errand (116), but before she can proceed she is addressed by Diniarchus, who has been listening to her tirade (cf. 112-13), and the remainder of the scene consists of dialogue between the two. At the end of the scene Diniarchus goes within to await Phronesium (208), and Astaphium is left alone on the stage; in a further topical song (ii. 1)² she gloats over his departure (209-12), describes the way in which he has been ruined (213-18), and justifies the tactics of meretrices (219 ff.); she develops the thought of the acceptable variety of lover (236 ff.), and illustrates the type by referring to the country youth who lives here (246 ff.), whom she wishes to see (249); she describes his servant (250-53), and finally carries out her purpose of calling upon them (253-55). In

¹On similar solos by young lovers see p. 97, n. 1.

²Astaphium's topical songs (97-111, 210-55) thus bracket the dialogue scene with Diniarchus; cf. Trin. i. 2 which is also bracketed by Megaronides' topical songs (23-38, 199-222).

response to Astaphium's call (253-55), Truculentus appears (ii. 2) in a very surly mood, and engages in dialogue with Astaphium. This amusing scene does little more than characterize Truculentus as the upright countryman, shocked by the dissipation of his young master, though it does give some slight exposition (cf. 297-98, 302-3);¹ upon Truculentus' departure to the forum to report to his old master (313-14), Astaphium soliloquizes briefly (315-21) upon the possibility of changing his attitude by blandishments. Diniarchus (ii. 3) comes out of Phronesium's house with the complaint that Phronesium has not yet finished bathing, and requests Astaphium to go in and hurry her up. He soliloquizes (335-51), until Phronesium appears, upon how little attention he receives in comparison with the Miles, due to his lack of funds. Phronesium enters at last (ii. 4) and greets him cordially; his resentment at his treatment is quickly appeased and Phronesium explains (386 ff.) the true situation regarding the Miles; by the end of the scene he is completely reensnared (cf. 426 ff.); upon her entrance into the house Diniarchus soliloquizes (434-47) upon his restoration to favor, which he believes to be genuine, and in his delight resolves to shower presents upon her.²

The exposition of the Truculentus is, as a whole, divided into two phases which present the situation from two points of view. The first phase consists of Diniarchus' monologue (i. 1) and interview with Astaphium (i. 2), which show the situation as he conceives it to be; the second phase consists of Astaphium's monologue (ii. 1), which shows the true estimation in which Diniarchus is held, and which, together with her interview with Trucu-

¹On the characterization of Truculentus see p. 103, n. 3.

²For similarities in form and content between the Truculentus and the Asinaria, see note 2, p. 135 for similarities with the Eunuchus, see note 5, p. 113.

lentus (ii. 2), reveals further elements of the situation unknown to Diniarchus. The situation is cleared up further by Phronesium herself in her interview with Diniarchus (ii. 4). The only characters who know all the facts are Phronesium and Astaphium. Diniarchus' knowledge is based on hearsay, for he has been away (91-92) and apparently has seen neither Astaphium nor Phronesium since his return (cf. 127, 335). Astaphium is the logical character for revealing the situation in regard to Strabax (246 ff.) and for the interview with Truculentus (ii. 2); Diniarchus is unaware of this rival (at least he does not mention him), and Phronesium naturally says nothing about him while trying to convince Diniarchus of the latter's restoration to favor (ii. 4). The exposition thus introduces all the important characters, with the exception of the Miles, who has not yet arrived from abroad (84-85, 202-3, 395 ff.); as Leo¹ puts it, the exposition is "ruled by the figure of Astaphium, who, in a series of graceful scenes, indicates the model, the prototype, of the perfect courtesan."²

¹Pl. F.2, p. 206.

²Unfortunately, from the point of view of the present study, in none of the extant fragments of the Menandrian plays is the exposition preserved completely. The only play of which we have the actual beginning is the *Hero*. The first scene consists of dialogue between the two slaves, Getas and Davus. Getas, moved by the obvious distress of Davus, inquires the trouble (cf. 1 ff.); the latter is induced to reveal his love-affair (cf. 18 ff.), and in so doing relates the circumstances surrounding Plangon and Gorgias, and the reason for their present servitude. The latter part of the scene is lost. Following this scene there appeared (judging from the list of *dramatis personae*, which has been preserved) the tutelary divinity Heros, who, in a deferred prologue, may be assumed to have revealed circumstances unknown to Davus, particularly concerning the early history of Plangon and Gorgias (cf. Jensen, p. xviii).

A somewhat similar exposition has been assumed for the *Epitrepontes* (cf. Jensen, pp. xxi-xxiii; Wilamowitz, *Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin, 1925), pp. 47 ff., 122-23). In the first scene (assuming that frag. 1 belongs in this position) the slave Onesimus enters, bringing with him a cook from the city. The cook, naturally curious and garrulous, who has heard something of Charisius' affairs (cf. frag. 1), inquires further about them, and this inquiry probably motivated an account of the situation as far as it

The preliminary expositions of the two plays of Terence on originals by Apollodorus, the Hecyra and the Phormio, have no unusual features. Each play is opened by a protatic character (Phor.), or characters (Hec.); this opening scene leads to dialogue with a slave, a prominent character of the play, in which the pre-suppositions are given; this expository scene is followed by a scene (Phor. 1. 3), or scenes (Hec. 11. 1, 2, 3) which do not advance the action, but which serve for characterization or for illustrative purposes.¹

The Hecyra opens (1. 1) upon a discussion between Philotis (meretrix) and Syra (anus), protatic characters, of Bacchis' desertion by Pamphilus; as we learn a bit later, they are just coming from a call upon Bacchis (cf. 97 ff.). Parmeno (servus) ap-

was known to Onesimus. Wilamowitz assumes (pp. 50-51; approved by Jensen, p. xxii) that, following their exit into the house, a god appeared to reveal the facts of the situation which were unknown to Onesimus. Then entered Chaerestratus and Simias, friends of Charisius, whose conversation has not been preserved; Simias went into the house, and Smicrines, the father-in-law of Charisius, appeared with a soliloquy (cf. 1 ff.) complaining of the extravagant and bibulous habits of Charisius. One may perhaps assume that the action of the play began with his entrance.

Part of the exposition of the Georgos is extant. According to Quint. xi. 3. 91 a youth, in a soliloquy, quoted the words of a woman; the quotation is lost, but the end of the youth's soliloquy has been preserved (1-21; cf. Jensen, p. xlviii), in which he apparently presented the situation from his point of view. Following his exit Myrrhina and Philinna are introduced (22-34) for the dialogue with the slave, Davus, who enters (35) with a report of developments at the farm of Cleaenetus, where Myrrhina's son has been working. The rest of the situation, which was unknown to the youth who spoke the opening soliloquy, is revealed, and the action was probably initiated following his report.

The beginning of the Periciromene, about 120 verses, is lost; it is probable, however, that it began, as did the Georgos, with a soliloquy, this time by Polemon (cf. 38; see also Jensen, p. xxxi). Then, according to Jensen (p. xxii), probably Glycera appeared with Doris, her maid, and lamented her situation; possibly also the youth Moschion appeared. At any rate the situation is eventually cleared up by the deferred prologue spoken by Agnoia, with which the Periciromene, in its present state, begins.

The fragments of the remaining plays are too scanty to allow us to form any definite idea of the exposition. For discussion of the traces of exposition in the Citharista, Colax, etc., see Jensen, pp. xlix ff.

¹For scenes with similar purpose see notes, pp. 118, 134.

pears from Laches' house, speaking to Scirtus within as he enters, giving directions as to what is to be told their master if he should inquire for him (76-80);¹ he sees Philotis, and they exchange greetings; he inquires as to Philotis' whereabouts all this time, and Philotis reveals that she has been away at Corinth with a Miles for two years (85 ff.); this, of course, motivates her ignorance of the situation; she inquires about what Bacchis had told them indoors (97 ff.), and teases Parmeno into describing the whole situation;² upon the conclusion of his account Parmeno proceeds on his errand and Philotis leaves to keep an appointment. The action technically begins with the next scene (ii. 1), though the second act actually does not advance the action.³

The Hecyra is a good example of a play in which the choice of expository characters is influenced by the structure of the action. When the play begins all of the characters have a partial grasp of the situation, but the important fact that Pamphilus has become detached from Bacchis, and is in love with his wife, is known only to Pamphilus, Bacchis, and Parmeno. Pamphilus has not yet returned from abroad (77). Bacchis does not appear until the denouement (v. 1), where the misunderstanding is cleared up. This essential information, then, must be given by Parmeno. The action which causes Bacchis to be summoned depends upon the ignorance of the fact that she is no longer an object of Pamphilus' interest. Therefore Parmeno cannot be allowed to reveal his information to an interested character, and it must either be given in monologue, or protatic characters must be introduced. The protatic characters chosen, Philotis and Syra, friends of Bacchis,

n. 2. ¹For other examples of this entrance technique see p. 115,

²On the form of Parmeno's narrative see p. 108, n. 2.

³See p. 134, n. 1.

motivate the giving of a complete account of the situation.

The Phormio begins (i. 1) with a monologue by the slave Davus (protatic), a friend of Geta's, in which he explains the reason for his coming to see the latter; in the course of his soliloquy some facts appear which serve to connect him, to a certain extent, to the play (cf. 35 ff.).¹ Geta appears from the house (i. 2), addressing someone within as he does so (51);² Davus interrupts him, greetings are exchanged, and Davus repays Geta the money he owes him, the reason for his call (cf. 51 ff.); he comments upon Geta's downcast appearance (57), and Geta is led to tell his troubles, which results in a full account of the situation.³ After the exit of Davus and Geta at the end of the latter's tale, Antipho and Phaedria, the adulescentes of the play, come on together (i. 3); each laments his lot, and considers the other more fortunate; the scene is purely for characterization;⁴ their laments are interrupted by the arrival of Geta (i. 4), and the action begins.

The choice of expository characters in the Phormio is more or less arbitrary. Geta, Antipho, Phaedria, and Phormio are all cognizant of the whole situation, and none are prevented by the conditions of the play from appearing in the opening scene as expository characters. The choice of Geta, then, probably resulted from the desire for a realistic opening scene between slaves. The choice of Davus, a protatic character, as listener is probably

¹Cf. Reidel, "The Dramatic Structure of Terence's Phormio," CW, XI (1917), 26.

²Cf. Hec. 76-80, above, and note 2, p. 115.

³Davus here, like Sosia in the Andria, and Philotis and Syra in the Hecyra, merely plays the part of a listener; his ignorance of the situation is not too convincing, as one wonders why he was not informed of the situation the day before, when Geta asked him for payment of the loan (cf. 35-38).

⁴On this scene see note 2, p. 118.

due, as Donatus remarks,¹ to a desire to provide someone who is ignorant of the circumstances, and thus motivate the narrative.

The Menaechmi (possibly from an original by Poseidippus) opens with the appearance of Peniculus, who enters with a parasite-solo (i. 1). He begins by explaining why he is called Peniculus (77-78). He continues with a discussion of the power of food and drink to bind a man to his patron (79-95); he then applies the principle he has developed to his own case (96-97), and announces that he is going to Menaechmus', whose "bond-servant" he is; he characterizes Menaechmus as a jolly good fellow (98 ff.).² He is on the point of making his presence evident when he sees Menaechmus coming out. The latter enters (i. 2) in the midst of a quarrel with his wife, whom he addresses within; he protests violently against her practise of keeping an eye upon him (110 ff.); in a monologue, not meant for the ears of his wife, he announces his intention of having a clandestine dinner (123-24); he is exulting over his successful theft of a mantle from his wife (127 ff.) when, to his great alarm, he is accosted by Peniculus (135) who has remained unobserved; after mutual greetings and lengthy persiflage, they decide upon a party to be held at the house of Erotium, Menaechmus' mistress; they call upon her (i. 3), make arrangements for the party, and Erotium is presented with the stolen mantle; Menaechmus and Peniculus leave for the forum to while away the time before the luncheon is to be ready, and Erotium (i. 4) sends her cook, Cylindrus, to market for provisions. Erotium goes within.³

In the following scene (ii. 1) Menaechmus II, accompanied

¹Donatus ad Phor. 35; see p. 148, n. 3.

²On parasite-solos see p. 116, n. 2.

³Scenes i. 2-4 are devoted to the presentation rather of general atmosphere than of specific information; cf. p. 125, n. 3.

by his slave Messenio, enters, having just arrived in Epidamnus. Messenio complains of their long journey, and Menaechmus, in quieting him, gives considerable essential information; Messenio warns Menaechmus of the dangers to be encountered in Epidamnus; in the midst of their discussion Cylindrus appears (ii. 2), returning from market, and the action begins.¹

The choice of expository characters is dictated to a certain extent by the action. Since the action revolves about the confusion caused by the similarity of the two brothers, each brother must be presented separately. Accordingly Menaechmus I, with his boon companions, Peniculus and Erotium, and his life of revelry despite his wife, appear in the second and third scenes. The circumstances in regard to Menaechmus II are known only to himself and his slave, and are revealed (ii. 1) in the conversation between them as they come from the harbor.

The opening scene of the Asinaria (from an original of Demophilus') consists of a lively dialogue between Demaenetus (senex) and his slave Libanus,² which presents all essential information; the motivation of the scene, like that of Andria i. 1, is a request for help, though with a difference; information is contributed by both Libanus and Demaenetus.³ The latter includes in the discussion a statement of his educational policy in the rearing of his son (64-83) which serves to characterize himself.⁴

¹There is a certain resemblance here to the exposition of the Curculio; in both plays early scenes serve largely for the presentation of general background rather than essential facts; in both plays explicit information follows, given upon the arrival of characters from abroad (Curc. ii. 3; Men. ii. 1); in both plays the action then gets underway.

²With this opening scene cf. And. i. 1.

³See below, pp. 157-58; see also p. 108, n. 2.

⁴For similar statements of educational policies, see And. 184-89; Epid. 382-93; Trin. 394-99; upon the use of this stereotyped device for characterization, see Wilner, op. cit., pp. 15 ff.

After agreeing to obtain the funds which Demaenetus desires for his son (107) Libanus leaves for the forum (108 ff.); Demaenetus, in a brief soliloquy (119-26) after the exit of his servant characterizes him, and in turn leaves for the forum to see his banker (125-26).

The exposition proper is now complete. The two following scenes (i. 2, 3), however, do not advance the action, but serve rather to present dramatically the predicament of Argyrippus which has been indicated in the opening scene (cf. especially 52-56).¹ In the first of these scenes (i. 2) Argyrippus enters, thrown out of the house by Cleareta (cf. 127), indulges in a virulent denunciation of mother and daughter, mentions the benefits he has bestowed upon them (141 ff.), and protests against the injustice of the treatment he is receiving; at last Cleareta comes out (i. 3), and the quarrel is continued in dialogue; the scene is devoted

¹These scenes which do not actually advance the action, but which present dramatically a situation which has been described in more or less detail before may be termed illustrative scenes. Similarly in the *Mercator* Demipho is introduced (ii. 1), and he presents his reactions to the situation--reactions which were described by Acanthio in the preceding scene (i. 2). In the opening scene of the *Stichus* (i. 1) Antipho's attitude, and his purpose of separating his daughters from their absent husbands, is described (cf. 14-17); in the second scene (i. 2) the situation is presented dramatically by Antipho's bringing up the subject of their returning home (cf. especially 127 ff.). Astaphium (*Truc.* 246 ff.) describes the third lover and his servant, characterizing the latter as a great savage who drives them off when he sees them (250-53); her interview with Truculentus in the next scene (ii. 2) presents Truculentus and illustrates Astaphium's description. The situation in the *Hecyra* is described fully by Parmeno in the second scene (i. 2); the action does not actually advance before the arrival of Pamphilus (iii. 1); the whole of the second act serves merely to introduce characters and to illustrate dramatically the situation as presented by Parmeno; ii. 1 introduces Laches and Sostrata and shows, primarily, Laches' attitude and reactions; ii. 2 presents Phidippus, and demonstrates his attitude; in ii. 3 Sostrata states her own. In the *Adelphoe* Micio (i. 1) describes himself and his brother; in the following scene both are presented in action; similarly *Ad.* ii. 1, in which Aeschinus, Parmeno and Sannio enter with the girl whom Aeschinus has taken by force, presents dramatically the situation as stated briefly by Demea in an earlier scene (cf. 88-92).

chiefly to characterization; Cleareta defends herself against Argyrippus' accusations, states the principles which govern her course of action (cf. especially 173 ff.; 216 ff.), and develops the theme of the necessity of having a continual supply of fresh lovers (177 ff.). In the course of the scene a bargain is struck, apparently for the first time;¹ Cleareta promises to keep her daughter for Argyrippus alone for one year, if he brings twenty minae before anyone else (229-31); at the end of the scene he leaves for the forum to see whether he can raise the necessary funds (243 ff.).²

¹For the contradiction between the striking of the bargain here, and the situation as depicted in i. 1 (cf. 74-75, 89), according to which Argyrippus had already known that he needed twenty minae, see Langen, Plaut. Studien (Berlin, 1886), pp. 97 ff.; see also p. 6, n. 1.

²The closest parallel to these scenes of the Asinaria (i. 2, 3) is to be found in the opening scenes of the Truculentus (i. 1, 2). There is a decided difference in the tone of the scenes, but the situation in each case is similar--both Argyrippus of the Asinaria, and Diniarchus of the Truculentus, are out of favor with their mistresses because their finances are low; in each play the youth appears with a monologue (Truc. i. 1), or semi-monologue (Asin. i. 2--Argyrippus actually directs his discourse to Cleareta within); this, in each case, is followed by a dialogue scene, in the Asinaria with the lena (i. 3), in the Truculentus with Astaphium (i. 2) who, while actually a servant of a meretrix, defends the lena's position (cf. 224); in the Truculentus the dialogue scene is followed by a soliloquy by Astaphium (ii. 1); in each play, also, the harshness displayed toward the youth is somewhat relaxed upon the prospect of further contributions (cf. Asin. 233 ff., Truc. 175 ff.). There is also a striking similarity in the sentiments expressed in the two scene-complexes; Argyrippus complains that he has lavished his possessions upon Cleareta and her daughter (Asin. 134-37, 187); Diniarchus has ruined himself with attentions to Phronesium (Truc. 112-13, 139); Argyrippus complains that there is no end to the demand for presents--that some new demand is continually being devised (Asin. 167-68); Diniarchus enumerates at some length the gifts required of the lover (Truc. 30 ff., 51 ff.); Cleareta states her policy of give and take--opera pro pecunia (Asin. 172); Diniarchus decides that amare oportet omnis qui quod dent habent (Truc. 76); Cleareta develops at length the theme that to a lena a lover is like a fish--no good unless fresh (Asin. 177-86); a little later she compares her profession to that of bird catching, developing the comparison fully (Asin. 215-26); Diniarchus also compares the lover to a fish, and goes into detail as to the devices used to catch him (Truc. 35 ff.); Astaphium also agrees with Cleareta's dictum as to the need for a supply of fresh lovers

In the Asinaria the possible expository characters are not limited by lack of knowledge of the general situation. The essential fact, however, that Demaenetus is cognizant of the situation and is willing to cooperate, which forms the basis of the action, can only be revealed by Demaenetus himself, as he is the only one who knows this at the point at which the play opens. Libanus, Leonida, Argyrippus, the Lena, and Philaenium are familiar with the rest of the situation. Leonida is eliminated from appearing in this exposition by the fact that he is needed to bring word about the arrival of the merchant from Pella (ii. 2). The choice of Libanus rather than of the others for the dialogue with Demaenetus is motivated by the fact that he is to take charge of obtaining the money, and therefore must be informed of his master's wishes. Argyrippus, the Lena, and Philaenium play no part in the intrigue.

The Amphitruo¹ begins with a monologue which is interpolated with asides by Mercury who, after giving the prologue, has remained on the stage unseen by the entering Sosia. The latter appears with a soliloquy obviously inspired by his alarm at being out at such an hour. The thought of the dangers to which he is

(Truc. 244-45, cf. 231 ff.); Cleareta remarks that now that Argyrippus has nothing to give, he has fallen back upon abuse (Asin. 188-89); Astaphium reminds Diniarchus that he, who used to be a first rate lover, now brings nothing to his mistress except complaints (Truc. 166-67); Argyrippus complains at length at the difference between the treatment he receives now, and that accorded to him when he was in funds (Asin. 204 ff.); Diniarchus mentions briefly the same state of affairs (Truc. 162-63); Argyrippus finally claims that he is not entirely ruined (Asin. 233 ff.); Diniarchus also has left some aedes et fundi (Truc. 174). Leo, ed. 1895-96, Vol. I, on Asin. 127, remarks upon the similarity between Asin. i. 2, 3 and the Truculentus; cf. also Leo, Pl. F. 2, p. 149: ". . . daneben [speaking of the Truculentus] steht die Asinaria in deren Original die Scene i. 2, 3 in offenbaren Abhängigkeit vom Original des Truculentus gedichtet sind."

¹In the case of this, and of the remaining plays, nothing is known of the originals, and there is little or no evidence upon which to base conjecture. As a result, any resemblances to identified plays are of especial interest.

exposed (153-62) is followed by a brief topical song on the theme of the hard lot of the slave of a rich master (163-75).¹ At this point Mercury indulges in an aside upon his own servile rôle. After some further timorous reflections Sosia turns to the thought of the recent successful campaign (186 ff.), and of his own errand (195 ff.); he decides to rehearse his report to Alcmena (201-2),² and in the course of his rehearsal gives a full account of the campaign (203-61); upon the conclusion of his tale he decides to start for home (262), and makes a few observations upon the length of the night (271 ff.), interspersed with asides by Mercury. As he starts to leave (291) he observes Mercury; both indulge in asides, with Mercury pretending not to see Sosia as far as vs. 341, where dialogue begins. The rest of the scene consists of the efforts of Mercury to convince Sosia that he is not Sosia, which finally results in Sosia's leaving in confusion for the harbor to find his master. Mercury, left alone (l. 2), adds some further information to that which he had previously given in the prologue.³

The choice of Mercury and Sosia for the preliminary exposition is dictated largely, one must assume, by the desire for the lively and amusing scene between the two. Amphitruo himself is as familiar with the facts which Sosia reports as is the lat-

¹ For other topical songs in the exposition see p. 97, n. 1.

² On the improbability involved in this rehearsal, see Brasse, Quatenus in fabulis Plautinis et loci et temporis unitatibus species veritatis neglegatur, Diss. (Breslau, 1914), p. 62.

³ There is some resemblance between the structure of the early scenes of the Amphitruo and that of the Andria; in both plays the greater part of the essential preliminary exposition occurs in the opening scene (Amph. 153-292; And. i. 1); in each play this scene is followed by a dialogue scene which serves to begin the action (Amph. 293 ff.; And. i. 2); and finally, in both cases a third scene, in monologue, gives further presuppositions (Amph. i. 2; And. i. 3). See p. 109, n. 1.

ter; Jupiter, in turn, would be as capable as Mercury of giving the rest of the situation.

The Captivi opens (i. 1) with a typical parasite solo by Ergasilus.¹ He begins by explaining that his nickname, Scortum, is due to the fact that he is always present, invocatus, at a banquet (69-76); he then considers the hard life of parasites in general, particularly when their patrons are away (77-90); he is led to consider his own case, and his discussion brings in considerable exposition (92-101); he characterizes his patrons, Philopolemus and Hegio (102-7), and is just on the point of calling upon Hegio when he sees the door open (108-9); Hegio appears (i. 2) with his Lorarius, and gives him instructions as to the care of the prisoners he had bought the day before (110-18); after a brief interchange of repartee Hegio sends the Lorarius in, and announces his intention of going to his brother's; however, before he can carry out his intention, he observes Ergasilus, and enters into conversation with him; Ergasilus sympathizes with Hegio in his difficulties, and considerable exposition, mainly repetitious, is included indirectly (cf. 140-41, 145-46, 169-71); Ergasilus finally extracts a reluctant invitation to dinner and leaves (191); Hegio, in a short exit monologue (192-94), announces his intention of going in to reckon up his bank balance before going to his brother's, and goes into the house.²

In the following scene (ii. 1) the Lorarius appears with the two captives, and after some persuasion permits them to talk together without being overheard (212 ff.); they rehearse their plan of action (219 ff.), and as a result the audience learns of

¹On other parasite solos see p. 116, n. 2.

²This scene scarcely advances the action, but introduces Hegio and establishes the mood of the piece (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 203). See p. 125, n. 3.

the exchange of rôles; in the midst of their mutual exhortations Hegio appears from the house (ii. 2) and proceeds to question them; the action begins at this point.

The exposition of the Captivi introduces all the important characters of the play. The situation from the point of view of Hegio is given by Ergasilus in the opening scene, and amplified in the following dialogue with Hegio; these two characters alone are available for this preliminary exposition, as Tyndarus and Philocrates, though they apparently have some idea, at least, of why they have been purchased (cf. 219 ff.), are not in a position to know the whole situation; the exchange in rôles is revealed by the prisoners (ii. 1), who alone know of it.

The Epidicus opens with a dialogue between two slaves,¹ Epidicus and Thesprio; Epidicus has been following Thesprio, who has just arrived from abroad, from the harbor, and has just caught up with him; after considerable repartee Thesprio reports briefly about his trip (19 ff.), and Epidicus lets drop some information about his own activities in Thesprio's absence (46-48, 59); Thesprio leaves and Epidicus, in a monologue (81-103), ponders upon his predicament, and the situation is amplified (cf. 87-90); he sees Stratippocles and Chaeribulus approaching, and stands aside. Stratippocles (i. 2) has been telling Chaeribulus the situation (cf. 104-5), and is being encouraged by the latter; further expository details are given incidentally (107-8, 110);² Epidicus, after listening to their conversation for some time, comes forward and greets his master; Stratippocles commands him

¹For other plays opening with dialogue between slaves, see Cas. i. 1; Most. i. 1; Pers. i. 1; Phor. i. 2; cf. also Epitr.; Hero. See p. 128, n. 2; on slave dialogues in general, see Schild, op. cit., pp. 7 ff.

²This scene serves largely for characterization; cf. the dialogue between Antipho and Phaedria, Phor. i. 3.

to find the necessary funds, Stratippocles and Chaeribulus leave, and Epidicus, again in a short monologue (158-65), ponders upon his future course of action, before going into Chaeribulus' house. The old men, Apocides and Periphanes, enter directly (ii. 1), continuing a discussion of Periphanes' tentative plan of marrying a poor woman of good family who bore a daughter of his;¹ Epidicus appears from the house, and the action may be considered to begin with the ensuing dialogue (181 ff.).

In the Epidicus two phases of the situation must be presented--the developments at home during the absence of Stratippocles, and the happenings abroad. This is accomplished by the

¹Cf. 168-72. This is the only reference in the play to Periphanes' thought of marriage. The technique here is, I believe, rather individual. From the analogy of other cases of double entrance we should expect some amplification of Apocides' remarks, at least later on in the play; however, the subject of the old men's conversation shifts (172 ff.), and there is no reference to the subject in the play. The entrance of two characters in the middle of a conversation is very common. Almost invariably, however, the subject under discussion is either made clear as the conversation proceeds, usually with little delay, or else it is clear from what has taken place earlier in the play. The entrance of Myrrhina and Philinna (Georg. 22 ff.) is quite typical; here Myrrhina remarks, as they enter, that she has told her tale to Philinna because of the latter's loyalty--that such is her present plight. Thus the subject of their previous conversation is evident. In the Phormio, as Phaedria and Dorio enter (485), the former is pleading with Dorio for delay; we do not learn the actual subject of the dispute, however, before vss. 510 ff.; at this point the whole situation becomes clear; the explanation here is delayed longer than usual. In the same play Demipho enters with friends he has summoned as advisors (348); as they enter he is asking audistis factam iniuriam quam haec est mihi? adeste quaeso (349-50); the subject of their previous conversation is thus rendered quite clear, for Demipho, upon his exit earlier, remarked (311 ff.) that he was going to the forum to call in some friends to assist him against Phormio.

The single case which I have observed, other than this instance in the Epidicus, in which two characters enter talking together, and in which no indication whatever is given as to the subject of their conversation, occurs Phor. 242 ff.; Syrus and Dromo, who had been sent to bring Clinia's mistress, are returning from their errand; as they appear Syrus asks Ain tu? to which Dromo replies sic est. Syrus notices that they have lost their companions, and remarks verum interea, dum sermones caedimus, illae sunt relictae. No further reference is made to their interrupted conversation. On this passage of the Epidicus, cf. Wheeler, AJP, XXXVIII (1917), 243 and n. 2; 250.

dialogue between Epidicus, who has remained at home, and Thesprio, who has just arrived from abroad. Epidicus alone is able to present his trickery and its results, as he alone knows the facts. The situation as it developed abroad, however, is known to Thesprio, Stratippocles, and more or less to the Danista who has accompanied them home. The Danista is eliminated, one may judge, because he has no part in the action of the play until the denouement (cf. v. 1). One may wonder, however, why Thesprio, who is to all intents and purposes a protatic character,¹ is introduced for the scene, since Stratippocles appears in the next scene and a good part of the information already given is repeated. The only reason he is introduced, apparently, is to provide the lively dialogue scene with Epidicus.

The opening scene of the Miles (i. 1) presents Pyrgopolinices and his attendants, including his parasite, Artotrogus (protatic); the scene serves for characterization only, and consists of flattery of the Miles by Artotrogus, with asides to the audience by the latter;² they leave, at the end of the scene, for the forum where Pyrgopolinices has some business to transact.³ The deferred prologue which follows (ii. 1) gives the presuppositions; Palaestrio announces that he is going to outline the plot of the play (79 ff.); he gives the Greek and Latin names of the comedy (86), the scene (88), characterizes the Miles (88-94), and narrates the plot (95 ff.); he then announces what the course of the action will be (145 ff.); Periplectomenus enters (ii. 2) and the action begins.

¹Thesprio, who has no further part in the action, appears, strikingly enough, once late in the play (657-65).

²For a similar dialogue see Eun. iii. 1. On these two scenes see N. Terzaghi, "Una scena di Plauto ed una di Terenzio," Mélanges Paul Thomas (Bruges, 1930), pp. 650-60.

³With this scene cf. Cist. i. 1, and p. 120, n. 2.

Palaestrio, Periplectomenus, Philocomasium, and Pleusicles are all familiar with the facts of the situation, so that the poet is allowed a choice. No one is more appropriate as an expository character than Palaestrio.¹ He is familiar at first hand with all that he describes, and it is largely through his efforts that Philocomasium and Pleusicles have been reunited. He is also responsible for the trick of the hole-in-the-wall (138), and throughout the play is active in the intrigue. Thus the poet here has chosen for the portrayal of the facts the character who is most familiar with them.

In the first scene of the Persa Toxilus enters with a short monologue (1-6), a topical discourse upon the difficulties besetting a lover with an empty purse; he considers his own case, and reveals that he has been having a hard time looking for a loan. His friend Sagaristio comes in with a corresponding six-line monologue (7-12) upon the duties of a faithful slave; he, in turn, considers his own case (10-12);² they catch sight of each other, and comment in balanced asides (13-15) before exchanging greetings (16); they have not seen each other for some time (20); their mutual inquiries result in Toxilus' outlining his situation, which supplies the necessary exposition; Sagaristio promises his assistance.³ The exposition is now complete; the second scene (i. 2), however, does not actually advance the action. Saturio enters, announcing himself as a parasite, a descendant of a long line of professional parasites; he mentions the source of the family cognomen (60), and then digresses with a discussion of informers (62 ff.); at the conclusion of his dis-

¹Cf. Leo, Pl. F.2, pp. 214 f.

²On topical songs, see p. 97, n. 1.

³On this use of the Doppelmonolog leading into dialogue, see Leo, Der Monolog, pp. 63 ff.

course, just as he announces his intention of going to Toxilus' house, he sees Toxilus' door opening.¹

In the Persa the general situation is known to almost the whole group of characters, with the exception of Sagaristio; Toxilus, Saturio,² Dordalus, and Lemniselenis all know the simple facts. The choice of Toxilus as the expository character, therefore, aside from the fact that he is the logical one as being primarily interested, is possibly conditioned by the necessity of informing Sagaristio of the facts, since he is to assist in the intrigue; Toxilus is the only character with a motive for revealing the situation to Sagaristio.

The Pseudolus begins (i. 1) with dialogue between Calidorus (adulescens) and his slave Pseudolus; the latter's inquiry as to what has been troubling his master, which eventually results in the reading of a letter which Calidorus had received from his sweetheart some days ago, leads to the giving of some of the main presuppositions of the play;³ Pseudolus promises his assistance; they observe Ballio coming out of his house, and stand aside.

Ballio enters (i. 2), driving out his slaves and upbraiding them for their worthlessness and deceitfulness; he had assigned them their duties yesterday, but he is compelled to remind them of them with a beating; he assigns their duties again, with threats of what will happen if they are not properly performed; Calidorus and Pseudolus comment aside; Ballio at length sends his

¹ On parasite-solos see p. 116, n. 2.

² We learn (116-18) that the situation had been explained to Saturio the day before. The fact that he was informed yesterday is well-motivated by Toxilus' remark on entering (5-6) as to his difficulties in raising a loan. On the use of this device to avoid repetition see p. 103, n. 1.

³ On the device of a letter see p. 151, n. 2.

slaves and meretrices within.¹ Calidorus and Pseudolus (i. 3), alarmed by Ballio's threats against Calidorus' sweetheart, consult as to their proper course of action; their discussion is brought to an end by Ballio's starting to leave, and they address him. After lengthy repartee Calidorus and Pseudolus bring up the subject of Calidorus' sweetheart and ask for an extension of time; they finally prevail upon Ballio to allow them another chance. Ballio leaves, and Pseudolus announces that he has a plan; Calidorus leaves to find someone to collaborate. Pseudolus, left alone on the stage (i. 4), ponders upon his course of action until he sees Simo and his neighbor, Callipho, approaching; with their entrance (i. 5) the action begins.

In the Pseudolus, as in the Poenulus (cf. p. 123) the matter of motive apparently controls the choice of the expository character. The three characters who know the facts are Phoenicium, Ballio and Calidorus. Phoenicium does not appear in the action. Ballio has no motive for revealing the facts until reproached by Calidorus (i. 3). Calidorus is thus the only character remaining who knows the facts; he has, as well, a motive for revealing them --the desire to enlist Pseudolus' help.

¹This scene is devoted entirely to characterization and to the presentation of general background (cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 216); see p. 125, n. 3; with Ballio's threatening complaints to his slaves cf. those of Antipho, Stich. 58-65.

2. The Methods of Introducing Expository Material

Closely related to the problem of presenting the necessary expository information in the early scenes of the play is the problem of motivating this presentation of the facts. On rare occasions information is given the audience in the form of direct address;¹ we are interested here, however, only in the presentation of material in scenes in which the dramatic illusion is preserved, and in the means which the poet employs to render his elucidation of past action and present circumstances realistic and life-like. For the sake of convenience we shall consider the question under the general headings of exposition by dialogue, and exposition by monologue.

Although, as we have shown in the first chapter, expository information² may be introduced, for the first time, at any

¹In spite of the frequent use of direct address to the audience the scenes, with the exception of the prologues, in which presuppositions, or essential facts--excluding mere explanation of immediate action--are given the audience in the form of direct address, are few; I have observed only three. In *Amphitruo* i. 2 (463-98), a prologizing monologue, Mercury explains to the audience (cf. 485: iamne hoc scitis quid siet?) the further confusion he intends to cause, and then adds some further details which were not included in the prologue (479-90; cf. 102-11). The Lena (*Cist.* i. 2) delivers a monologue to the audience (cf. 145-46) which is motivated to a certain extent by her apology (120-22). She continues with an account of her finding of Selenium, and of her turning her over to Melaenis, who was anxious for a child to palm off upon a lover from abroad; Melaenis has pretended she was her own child (123-45). *Mercator* ii. 1 (225-71), which includes some expository material, contains an address to the audience (267: vosmet videte ceterum quanti siem); but from the general tone of this soliloquy one may be justified in concluding that the address to the audience comprises line 267 only.

²In this chapter, as elsewhere in this discussion, we are using the terms "exposition" and "expository" in the technical sense of the presentation of the presuppositions, or of essential

point in the play, we shall concentrate upon the preliminary exposition which occurs in the early scenes before the action has got underway; as a general thing essential facts introduced after the action begins are isolated, i.e., there is seldom any large amount of information to be presented at any one time. In the scenes before the beginning of the action, however, the poet's difficulties are increased by the necessity of bringing before the audience a comparatively large body of facts. The difficulties involved are evidenced by the frequently mechanical devices employed. The early scenes are thus more likely to be significant as regards the poet's technique than passages in which isolated facts are introduced later. Usually the preliminary exposition is complete before the beginning of the action; in some cases,¹ however, the technical initiation of the action is followed directly by further expository scenes; these we shall include in the discussion; references will be made in the footnotes to the more important instances of exposition in later portions of the plays.²

We shall consider first of all expository scenes in which information is given by means of dialogue. The problem of motivation here is simpler than in the case of monologues. As we shall see, frequently one at least of the two or more characters appearing in the scene is, like the audience, ignorant of the circumstances, and while he is being informed the audience also gains

facts and conditions that prevailed prior to the beginning of the play; thus we shall rule out of consideration here all scenes which are "expository" only in the sense that they are explanatory of the action, or that they present situations which have developed since the beginning of the play.

¹ Amph., Asin., Merc., Poen., Rud., Truc., And., Phor.,
Heaut.

² For a general discussion of motivation, see Legrand, Daos (1910), pp. 520 ff.

a knowledge of the situation. The problem of the dramatist here, then, is to provide a reasonable motive for informing the character who is ignorant of the facts, and to make the fact that he is ignorant of the circumstances plausible. Certain more or less obvious devices are used. The first to be considered we may call the motivated question.

The main presuppositions of the Persa are given in the first scene, in a dialogue between the two slaves, Toxilus and Sagaristio. Toxilus enters with a short soliloquy (1-6) on the theme of love, and reveals incidentally that he has been looking for a loan (5-6). Sagaristio appears, also with a short soliloquy (7-12), on the subject of the good and the bad slave, and dialogue begins (16) after several asides as they catch sight of each other.¹ It becomes evident immediately (cf. 20-22) that they have not seen each other for a long time, and mutual inquiries are naturally in order. Thus the fact that Sagaristio is not aware of Toxilus' love-affair, or of his financial straits, is well-motivated. Sagaristio's inquiry (23), Satin tu usque valuisti? gives Toxilus an opening, and he proceeds to air his troubles--he has been wounded in Veneris proelio (24-25), and this is the day which determines whether his sweetheart shall obtain her freedom or remain a slave (34). Incidentally, his master is abroad (29). In the course of asking Sagaristio for a loan (35 ff.) he reveals that he needs six hundred nummi (36); this request for a loan is well prepared for by Toxilus' opening monologue (cf. 5-6). The motivation used here, then, consists of a question, rendered

¹For motivation of the presence of characters, see below. In this case the presence of neither Toxilus nor Sagaristio is any too well motivated. Although the motivation of presence, or its lack, may affect considerably the verisimilitude of the scene, we are concerned here only with the motivation of the giving of information.

natural by the circumstances, which leads to an account of the situation; a request for assistance (36) discloses some further information.

Davus (Phor. 1. 1) enters with a short monologue, which serves chiefly to motivate his presence (cf. 35-38). It is tied up with the following expository scene by his remark (39-40):

nam erilem filium eius duxisse audio
uxorem: ei credo munus hoc conraditur.

Geta appears from the house (51) and after mutual greetings Davus inquires (57) sed quid tu es tristis?¹ which leads to further questions (58, 61), and Geta is induced to disclose the difficulties in which he is involved, and how they came about. His account is practically a monologue,² interrupted by an occasional question by Davus, and narrates fully all essential information.³ The technique employed here resembles very closely that used in the Persa (see above)--one friend, who is ignorant of the circumstances,⁴ elicits the situation from another by means of questions; the questions themselves are motivated, Sagaristio's by the fact that he has not seen Toxilus for such a long time, Davus' by Geta's gloomy appearance. In the Persa there is the further motivation of a request for assistance. A request for assistance occurs also

¹For other instances of this formula see Ad. 82; Cas. 171; for similar thought cf. Pseud. 9-11; Heros 1 ff.

²Cf. p. 108, n. 2.

³On the reason for the use of Davus, a protatic character, here, cf. Donat. Phor. 35: "quod in omnibus fere comoediis, in quibus perplexa argumenta sunt, fieri solet, id in hac quoque Terentius servat, ut protaticόν πρόσωπον, id est personam extra argumentum, inducat; cui dum ob hoc ipsum, quod veluti aliena <a> tota fabula est, res gesta narratur, discat populus textum et continentiam rerum sitque instructus ad cetera."

⁴Davus' ignorance of the situation is not so well-motivated as that of Sagaristio in the Persa, for Davus reveals that Geta had gone to him the day before to ask him to repay a loan (35-38). One may wonder why some, at least, of this information was not conveyed to him then.

in the Phormio, but it has already been made (cf. 35-38) and is used to motivate Davus' (a protatic character's) presence rather than the giving of the information.¹

Philotis and Syra (Hec. i. 1) appear on their way from a call upon Bacchis (cf. 97-98), discussing the fact that Pamphilus, who had sworn faithfulness to her, has taken a wife (60-63). They meet Parmeno (i. 2), a slave of Pamphilus', and an old acquaintance of theirs, and in the course of their greetings we learn that Philotis has been away from Athens for two years, at Corinth (84-87). She naturally, therefore, is unacquainted with matters of local gossip, and her inquiry (97-100) concerning Bacchis, about whom she has just been talking (60-63), is perfectly logical. Parmeno, after some slight cajoling (cf. 103 ff.), is induced to tell the whole story (114 ff.), interrupted by an occasional question by Philotis. The expository information here, then, as in the two preceding cases, is elicited by motivated questions. Here, as in the Phormio, a monologue is avoided by the use of protatic characters (Philotis and Syra).

At the opening of the Heauton (i. 1) Menedemus is discovered at work on his land. He is accosted by his next door neighbor (54) Chremes, who, in the course of explaining his reasons

¹The Hero of Menander opens with a scene which bears considerable resemblance to those just discussed. The slaves Getas and Davus are found in the middle of a conversation. Getas remarks (1 ff.) that Davus must have been engaged in some mischief and must be expecting punishment to account for his groans and beating his head. He is led to inquire the reason for these actions, and Davus describes his position, which presents the situation from his point of view. Getas, from his questions, is obviously ignorant of the facts, but as the play stands we cannot say how this ignorance was justified; perhaps this was done in the last part of the scene, which has been lost.

Apparently the early scenes of the Epitrepontes contained a somewhat similar dialogue between Onesimus, a slave, and a cook whom he is bringing home (cf. n. 2, p. 128). Here the motivation for the interrogation was apparently curiosity (cf. frag. 1).

for doing so, discloses part of the situation (53-74). We are informed immediately that the two men have not been acquainted long (53-55):

quamquam haec inter nos nuper notitia admodumst
(inde adeo quom agrum in proxumo hic mercatus es)
nec rei fere sane hoc amplius quicquam fuit . . .

and Chremes' ignorance of Menedemus' affairs is thereby partially justified.¹ Chremes attempts to rationalize his intrusion and his questions--he is led to admonish Menedemus because he sees him working harder than either his age warrants or his circumstances demand (56-60). Menedemus protests at this exhibition of curiosity (75-76) and Chremes defends himself in the famous line (77), homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto; by thus branding himself as an outstanding busybody he really motivates his questions; he continues with his reason for interfering in this particular case (78-79):

vel me monere hoc vel percontari puta:
rectumst, ego ut faciam; non est, te ut deterream.

He finally prevails upon Menedemus to tell his story, which makes clear the entire situation (97-150). The technique of this scene, then, involves the use of both question and admonition,² though the admonition is used chiefly to justify Chremes' questions. The conditions noted above are fulfilled--Chremes is ignorant of Menedemus' affairs, this ignorance is explained by the circumstances, and his questions are motivated--here mainly by his curiosity. This motivation serves the further purpose of characterizing Chremes.

The Pseudolus begins with a dialogue scene (1. 1) in which the presuppositions of the plot are given. Pseudolus, who justifies

¹See p. 162, n. 1.

²For the use of admonition as a means of motivation, see below.

fies his questions by the fact that he has previously been Calidorus' confidant (16-17),¹ and by the fact that he is desirous of giving assistance (19), inquires why Calidorus has been going about so sorrowfully for the past many days (9-11). Calidorus is induced to show him a letter, which he had received from his sweetheart. This letter, which Pseudolus reads aloud, amplified by a few details given in the course of the dialogue which follows, provides the essential exposition.² There is a certain lack of plausibility in Pseudolus' entire ignorance of the situation, since he is, or at least has been, the confidant of Calidorus (cf. 16-17). It is also inconsistent with Simo's statement (415 ff.) that the circumstances have been a subject of common gossip, and that he himself has observed them. Thus one of the necessary conditions for successful employment of the motivated question--rendering the questioner's ignorance plausible--is not fully met.³ The questions themselves are sufficiently motivated.

The general situation of the Curculio is disclosed in the opening scene (i. 1), a dialogue between Palimurus (protatic) and his master, Phaedromus, in which Phaedromus, in reply to Palimurus' questions (cf. 1-2, 12, 13, 23-26, 62) makes known the circum-

¹The explicit reference to someone as a confidant, as a motivation of exposition, occurs elsewhere: cf. Poen. 129 ff. (cf. 156); Truc. 215-16 (cf. 388); Eun. 126-28; the confidential relations between Parmeno and Pamphilus in the Hecyra are emphasized (130-31, cf. especially 410), but are used to explain the source of Parmeno's knowledge, rather than as motivation of exposition.

²The device of a letter may have been used in the lost opening of the Bacchides. For discussion and bibliography, see H. H. Law, "The Metrical Arrangement of the Fragments of the Bacchides," CP, XXIV (1929), 197-201.

³On the lack of plausibility here involved, see Langen, Plaut. Studien (Berlin, 1886), p. 198; in general see Legrand, Daos, pp. 522 ff.

stances. The motivation of Palinurus' ignorance is poor.¹ He is on the most intimate terms with his master, as may be judged from the liberties he takes (passim), and yet he does not even know that his master is having a love-affair, to say nothing of any of the details of it. No reason is advanced for his being so poorly informed.² Furthermore, there is little motivation for the questions themselves. One must infer that they are due to mere curiosity, or, perhaps, to petulance caused by being brought along on such an expedition at such an hour (cf. 1-2).

Petulance also motivates questions in the Menaechmi. Part of the situation is revealed (ii. 1) in the dialogue between Menaechmus II and Messenio as they come from the harbor upon their arrival in Epidamnus. The information is given in the course of question and answer, but the technique used differs from that of the preceding examples. Here Messenio obviously knows the answers to his own questions--the reason for their coming to Epidamnus (cf. 230), and the limits of their search (cf. 233). His petulant questions, then, are a form of complaint, and are therefore perfectly natural under the circumstances.³

Other instances in which the exposition is less extensive may be mentioned. Demea (Ad. 1. 2), in reply to Micio's question

¹Cf. Leo, Plautinische Forschungen² (Berlin, 1912), p. 196: "Durch das Gespräch im Anfang des Circulio erfahren wir der vorbedingungen der Handlung in der Weise, dass der Herr dem Diener erzählt . . . : alles Dinge, die Palinurus längst wissen muss (vgl. v. 14); wie denn auch v. 230 sq. der Kuppler und Palinurus in freundschaftlichem verhältnis stehn. Dies ist ein Motiv, das lediglich dem Zwecke der Exposition dient, ein Notbehelf, dessen Unwahrscheinlichkeit der dramatische Dichter hinnimmt eben um den erzählenden prologus zu vermeiden, an dessen Stelle als anderen Notbehelf die πρόσωπα προτατικά treten." Cf. also Legrand, Dacs, pp. 522 ff.

²Cf. particularly And. 1. 1; see p. 108, n. 1; cf. also Pseud., above.

³For Langen's criticism of this device, see Plaut. Studien, p. 149.

(82) quid tristis es?¹ discloses the immediate situation--that Aeschinus has broken down a door, forced his way into a strange house, beaten the owner and all the household almost to death, and carried off the girl he loved (87-91). Cleostrata (Cas. 11. 2) explains her difficulties in answer to Myrrhina's questions (171: sed quid tu es tristis, amabo?² cf. 178, 184, 187-88, 198), and we learn that her husband is flouting her (189-90), that he is in love with a maid-servant of Cleostrata's--one she brought up at her own expense--and that he is planning to marry her, against Cleostrata's will, to his vilicus (193-96). Hegio (Capt. 11. 2) questions his prisoners, preliminary to sending the pseudo-Philocrates home to effect an exchange for his son, and considerable information is revealed in a thoroughly natural manner. Mercury (Amph. 1. 1), in reply to Sosia's questions as to the spoils, and the signet ring (418, 420, 422), reveals that Amphitruo was presented with King Pterelas' bowl (419), which is in a chest sealed with Amphitruo's signet (420-21); the signet bears Sol rising in a four-horse chariot (422). Phaedromus (Curc. 1. 3), in answering Planesium's question (204-5) as to how long they must go on in this way, discloses (206-7) that he sent his parasite to Caria three days ago to raise some funds, and that he will be back today. Plesidippus (Rud. 1. 2), on being questioned by Daemones (142-43), admits that he had been invited to the temple for a prandium, and that his host had not come (143).³

¹See p. 148, n. 1.

²See n. 1.

³The motivated question is used to disclose considerable information in a scene well along in the *Poenulus*. The technique is worthy of notice. Syncerastus, the servant of Lycus, appears (iv. 2) on his way home from the temple of Venus, where the leno has been sacrificing. After a soliloquy of some length, interspersed with asides by Milphio (823-51), who is present on the stage, he is accosted by the latter (851). Considerable repartee ensues, culminating in a particularly vile joke by Syncerastus (862-63):

A device used in several expository scenes is that of a request for help. Such a request naturally involves an explanation of the circumstances leading up to it, and may be made to cover the presuppositions of the play. It is particularly effective when the person whose assistance is desired is entirely ignorant of the situation, but even when he is partially conversant with the details it is quite natural to have a review of the facts in order to arrive at a clear understanding.

Selenium (Cist. i. 1) had invited the Lena and Gymnasium to luncheon (9-11), with the intention of asking a favor of them (82)--that Gymnasium might stay at her house and look after things

MI. quid agis? SY. facio quod manifesti moechi hau ferme solent.

MI. quid id est? SY. refero vasa salua. MI. di te et tuom erum perduint!

Milphio's exclamation (863), di te et tuom erum perduint, leads to Syncerastus' reply (864-65):

me non perdent; illum ut perdant facere possum si velim
meum erum ut perdant, nei mihi metuam, Milphio. . . .

After further repartee Milphio urges Syncerastus (881 ff.) to explain what he means, and Syncerastus finally reveals (894-900) that Adelphasium and Anterastilis are freeborn, that the leno bought them as children in Anactorium for eighteen minae, together with their nurse, that the vendor admitted that they were stolen from Carthage. In his surprise Milphio comments (900-904) that his master, Agorastocles, was stolen away as a child from the same place, that he was brought here and sold, and that he was adopted and inherited the fortune of his adoptive parent.

The motivated question is used effectively in the Rudens in a scene between Ampelisca and Trachalio (ii. 3). Their opening questions (cf. 342-43):

TR. sed quam mox coctum est prandium? AM. quod prandium, obsecro te?

TR. nemp' rem diuinam facitis hic? AM. quid somnias, amabo?

quickly show that they are talking at cross purposes, and in the explanations which follow the whole situation, as developed in the earlier part of the play in a more or less fragmentary fashion, is summarized.

Question and answer, of course, is used constantly throughout the play, and isolated expository facts are occasionally revealed in this way. Cf., e. g., Most. 624 ff.; Miles 171-76; And. 325.

for the next three days (104-5).¹ In the course of her explanation of the reason for her request (cf. Gymnasium's command (56-57), . . . eloquere utrumque nobis, et quid tibi est et quid velis nostram operam, ut nos sciamus, she reveals the circumstances of her love-affair (68-95)--her lover swore he would marry her, but now his father is trying to force him to marry a Lemnian relation of his (98-104); her mother, accordingly, has summoned her home (105).

Bacchis (Bac. i. 1) is requesting Pistoclerus' help in raising money (46) on her sister's behalf (42-44). In the course of her explanation of her request we learn that her sister, who has just arrived today (94), belongs to a Miles (42-45), who is expected to arrive shortly (47); that the money is necessary to obtain her freedom (46); that Pistoclerus, in assisting her, will be aiding his chum at the same time (60).

The main presuppositions of the Eunuchus are given in dialogue (i. 2) between Thais, Phaedria, and Parmeno. Thais had summoned Phaedria (cf. 100) to gain his assistance (150-52)--she wishes him to permit a certain Miles to monopolize her time for a few days. In explaining the situation which has led her to make this request she discloses essential facts--the history of the kidnapped girl (107-20), how she came into the possession of the Miles (125-36), his reasons for refusing to make Thais a present of her (137-43), and Thais' reasons for wishing to obtain her

¹Langen, Plaut. Studien, p. 129, considers it quite singular that Selenium, after asking Gymnasium and the Lena to luncheon with the express purpose of requesting Gymnasium to take charge of the house for three days, first brings up the subject after the luncheon is finished and the guests are already in the street upon the point of departure. But, obviously, this lack of verisimilitude is inevitable with a fixed outdoor stage-setting; the important thing is to bring the facts before the audience; cf. Brasse, Quatenus in fabulis et loci et temporis unitatibus specietes veritatis neglegatur, Diss. (Gryph., 1914), pp. 56 ff.

(144-49). The completeness of her narrative is further motivated by her remark (126-28) that ever since she met Phaedria she has made him her confidant in everything.¹

A scene which very closely resembles the one just discussed occurs in the Truculentus (11. 4). Phronesium has a similar request to make--she desires Diniarchus to allow her to devote herself to a Miles for a few days (417-22); cf. Eun. 150-52). Diniarchus has always been her confidant (388: tibi mea consilia semper summa credidi; cf. Eun. 126-28); this motivation is further emphasized by Astaphium's reference, three scenes earlier, to this relationship between Phronesium and Diniarchus (215-16):

verum apud hunc mea era sua consilia summa eloquitur libere,
magi'que adeo ei consiliarius hic amicus quam auxiliarius.²

In justifying her request Phronesium explains the circumstances in considerable detail.³

The Andria opens (i. 1) with an expository dialogue between Simo and his freedman (cf. 37), Sosia. Simo professes to desire Sosia's assistance in counterfeiting the marriage, and in keeping an eye on things generally (168-70). In the course of explaining his son's conduct, and his own plans, so that Sosia will know what he is to do (cf. 48-50) Simo describes fully the past circumstances and the present situation as far as he knows it. The presence of Sosia serves merely to prevent a monologue.⁴ Since Sosia is a protatic character and disappears at the end of

¹ On this device cf. p. 151, n. 1.

² On other confidants, see p. 151, n. 1.

³ On similarities between the Truculentus and Eunuchus, see p. 113, n. 5.

⁴ Cf. Donat. 14: "consciis sibi est primam scaenam de Perinthia esse translatam, ubi senex ita cum uxore loquitur, ut apud Terentium cum liberto. at in Andria Menandri solus est senex."

the scene, Simo's request for assistance is purely an artificial motivation for the conveying of essential information to the audience.¹

A request for help in a slightly disguised form is found in the opening scene of the Poenulus (i. 1), a dialogue between Agorastocles and his slave Milphio. Agorastocles' opening remarks (129-34),

saepe ego res multas tibi mandavi, Milphio,
dubias, egenas, inopiosas consili,
quas tu sapienter, docte et cordate et cate
mihi reddidisti opiparas opera tua.
quibus pro benefactis fateor deberi tibi
et libertatem et multas gratas gratias,²

are obviously leading up to a request for assistance, a fact which Milphio observes (152)--sed quid nunc tibi vis? He accordingly volunteers his assistance (159) before Agorastocles actually asks for it. Essential facts are brought before the audience, some of which, at least, are already known to Milphio (cf. 156: iam pridem equidem istuc ex te audiui).

A rather subtle form of the request for help is employed in the Asinaria. Libanus (Asin. i. 1), after putting Demaenetus upon oath, is on the point of asking him a question (29-30) when Demaenetus breaks in upon his burlesque hesitation, and, as if forestalling Libanus' question, shows that he is already aware

¹ This motivation may, with considerable probability, be attributed to Terence himself, rather than to Menander, since, according to Donatus (And. 14--see above), Terence substituted Sosia for the uxor in Menander's Perinthia. One may doubt whether the same motivation would be applicable there, especially since the uxor would be expected to be conversant, at least to a certain extent, with the situation. A request for help is also used in And. ii. 1. Charinus greets Pamphilus with a passionate appeal (319)--ad te advenio spem salutem auxilium consilium expetens. In the explanation that follows we learn that he is in love with Pamphilus' sponsa (324), but that there has been nothing between them (325-26). This motivation may also perhaps be Terence's own; cf. Donat. 301 (see p. 65, n. 4).

² On this device, cf. p. 151, n. 1.

of his son's affair (47-50, 52-54). In the discussion which follows, in the course of which Demaenetus requests Libanus to aid his son (90), the essential facts are presented (56-98). It is interesting to note that both men are familiar with practically the whole situation, but that the exchange of information is necessary if they are to cooperate intelligently, a thing which Demaenetus desires.¹

A device which is especially useful when a large amount of material is to be presented is that of the returning traveller. A report of his trip and his experiences is perfectly natural, and may be given in monologue (cf. Sosia, Amph. 1. 1), or in dialogue. It is particularly effective in a dialogue scene, as the mutual questions inevitable on such an occasion frequently lead to a full exposition of the whole situation--the traveller reports facts which he has learned abroad, and which may be essential to an understanding of the situation, while his questioner in turn reveals the circumstances at home.²

An excellent example of the use of this technique is found in the opening scene of the Epidicus (1. 1). Epidicus, who has been pursuing Thesprio from the harbor (14), finally catches up with him, and a lively dialogue ensues. Epidicus questions Thesprio about the campaign, and about their master, and in the course of the conversation we gather the essential facts that Stratippocles had fallen in love (45) with a beautiful captive and had bought her from the spoils (43-44) for forty minae (52) which he

¹Demaenetus explains his compliance with his son's wishes (74-76) as due to his desire to retain his affection (77). The real reason for his indulgence, however, does not appear until considerably later (734-36), at the point where Libanus hands over to Argyrippus the twenty minae on condition that he agree to his father's stipulation (736): noctem huius et cenam sibi ut dares.

²Thus dialogues of the returning traveller type may be considered a form of motivated question.

borrowed at interest from a money-lender at Thebes (53-54), who has come along with him looking for his cash (55). His news causes Epidicus to explain that Stratippocles, before his departure, had commissioned him to buy a music girl, with whom Stratippocles was in love, from a leno--Epidicus has carried out his instructions (46-48). Thus the whole situation is revealed in a well-motivated scene.

The same motivation is used in the following scene (Epid. 1. 2). Stratippocles and his friend Chaeribulus enter, just as Stratippocles has finished telling the story of his difficulties (104-5)--the account of a returned traveller. In the dialogue which follows, in which Chaeribulus attempts to encourage his friend (cf. 106-8, 112), we learn incidentally that the captive is well-born (107), and that Stratippocles has done nothing to sully her innocence (114), and also that he is in need of forty minae to repay a danista from whom he borrowed the money at interest (114-15). Epidicus comes forward (126) and joins the conversation. The situation is again recapitulated, and some few further details are added.

Chrysalus (Bac. 11. 2) is returning from abroad (cf. 170-71) and has been sent ahead to see Pistoclerus, his master's chum (172-77). In the conversation which follows his meeting with Pistoclerus (181) he does not convey any essential information himself (the fact that the travellers have brought back a sum of money is not revealed until Chrysalus' soliloquy [229 ff., after Pistoclerus' exit (228)]) but he does serve to elicit important facts from Pistoclerus--that Mnesilochus' sweetheart has been discovered (199, 200), that she still loves Mnesilochus (207), and that a Miles is expected in the near future who will demand money

for letting Bacchis go (221-23).¹

Curculio (Curc. 11. 3) returns from Caria, where he had been sent upon a mission (cf. 67-68, 143-44, 206-7), and reports the result of his trip to his patron--he had been unsuccessful in raising a loan (302-4), but he had met a Miles who had contracted to buy Phaedromus' sweetheart from the leno, and had arranged with a banker in Epidaurus to complete the transaction upon receipt of a letter sealed with the Miles' ring. This ring Curculio had stolen (328-63). The situation at home has been revealed earlier (1. 1), and Curculio is familiar with the circumstances, so that his account does not elicit further information from Phaedromus.

One of the best examples of the returning traveller's report is that of Sosia in the opening scene of the Amphitruo (1. 1), which is given, in contrast to the cases already discussed in monologue.² Sosia has been sent ahead from the harbor to report Amphitruo's arrival to Alcmena (195-96, cf. 163-64b). His monologue is well-motivated as such by his obvious fright (cf. 153-54)--he is clearly talking to himself to keep up his courage. He decides to rehearse his report to Alcmena (201-2), and his account (203-61) brings in a full description of Amphitruo's campaign. This information is, in large part, unessential as far as the ac-

¹ The information conveyed in this scene is largely a recapitulation as far as the audience is concerned, as we can see even though the first part of the play is fragmentary (cf. 1. 1). The fact that Chrysalus does not give a full account of his trip to Pistoclerus may be due to an effort on the part of the dramatist to avoid repetition, since Chrysalus reports his trip also to Nicobulus (11. 3). While the tale he tells Nicobulus is largely a wild invention (cf. 349 ff.), we learn something of the son's errand abroad (cf. 249-50, 263-64, 272).

² Just as the whole play is a travesty on tragedy, so Sosia's monologue is a parody of the speech of the tragic messenger. On this scene cf. Fraenkel, De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae, Diss. (Gött., 1912), p. 38; Leo, Pl. F. 2, p. 134; Leo, Der Monolog im Drama (1908), p. 70; Legrand, Daos, p. 414.

tion of the play is concerned.¹

A device similar to that of the returning traveller, and in some cases identical,² is that of what may be termed the messenger, either self-appointed, or otherwise. In the course of his report, or of the reaction aroused by it, expository facts may be presented. In general, of course, what we are calling messenger scenes are a result of the fixed stage-setting. Since no change of scene is possible, and a considerable part of the action of the comedies takes place off-stage, the reporting of off-stage action is rather extensive; but, as one would expect, there is not a great deal of such action to be reported in the early scenes of the play, since the action has not yet actually got underway.

Acanthio (Merc. 1. 2) rushes up from the harbor to report to Charinus that his father has seen the girl (180-81) on board the ship (187), that he began to pet her (203), and that he (Acanthio) informed him that Charinus had bought the girl as a present for his mother (201-2). His report initiates the action of the play.

We may perhaps include under this category Clitipho's report in the Heauton (1. 2), although, to be sure, his role of messenger is not so self-evident as that of Acanthio in the Merca-

¹The device of the returned traveller's report may perhaps be seen in Menander's Citharista. Here Moschion, who has sought an interview with his father (cf. 54, 66-67) apparently relates his experiences while in Ephesus (cf. 91 ff.). The only instance of a returned traveller's report, late in the play, which is important for exposition, occurs in Phor. iv. 1, the dialogue scene directly following Chremes' arrival from Lemnos (567), in which Demipho questions Chremes about his trip; some essential information is divulged; we hear of Chremes' search for his daughter, and of his learning that she, with her mother, had set out for Athens to join him; they had arrived safely. We also learn that the two old men had had in mind Antipho's marrying Chremes' daughter (568-82).

²Sosia, Amph. i. 1, is both a returned traveller and a messenger (cf. 163-64); cf. also Chrysalus, Bac. ii. 1.

tor. He appears from the house looking for his father (179), obviously to relate that he has brought Clinia home for dinner (cf. 182-83). In the course of his explanation we gather some information--that Clinia has returned home, the details of his arrival (182-84), and that he is still in love with his mistress (188-90).¹ Here Clitipho acts as the messenger reporting the arrival of the returning traveller.²

¹There is a certain improbability involved in the fact that Chremes had been unacquainted with Menedemus and his affairs (see above, pp. 149f.), while at the same time Clitipho and Clinia have been intimate friends from boyhood (183-84); cf. Legrand, *Rev. des Ét. Gr.*, XVI (1903), p. 352; Koehler, *De Hautontimorumeni Terentianae compositione*, Diss. (Lipsiae, 1908), p. 7, n. 1; Kroll, "Die Handlung des Hautontimorumenos," *Jahresb. der Schles. Gesell. f. vaterl. Cultur* (1927), pp. 123-24. A somewhat similar situation is found in the *Trinummus*; in the interview between Philto and his son, Lysiteles (II. 2), Philto displays greater ignorance of his next-door neighbor and his affairs than one would expect (cf. especially 330 ff.), particularly since these affairs have been the talk of the town (cf. 98 ff., 212 ff.); see Langen, *Plaut. Studien*, p. 224.

²This device is used in the *Georgos*. Daos enters (35) with provisions for the wedding, sees Myrrhina, and, remarking that he wishes to be the first to tell her of some good news (43-45), relates in detail the happenings on the farm of Cleaenetus. Examples of the messenger motivation are found also in cases of deferred exposition. Leonida (Asin. II. 2) reports his running into the merchant from Pella in the barber shop (333, 336, 343), and we learn of Saurea's previous sale of the Arcadian asses (333-34) for twenty minae (348)--a necessary presupposition, as it forms the basis of the intrigue.

Syrus (*Heaut.* II. 3), who is returning from summoning Clinia's mistress (cf. 191), relates to Clinia and Clitipho (264 ff.) the story of his errand, and in so doing reveals that his mistress is still in love with Clinia (265-66, 304-7), that there is no doubt of her faithfulness (282 ff.), and that the old woman, who was posing as her mother, is dead (269-71).

The true situation in regard to Aeschinus in the *Adelphoe* is suggested in the brief dialogue between Sostrata and Canthara (III. 1), and is disclosed fully (III. 2) when Geta comes upon them and angrily reports what he has learned--that Aeschinus has carried off (as Geta supposes) another sweetheart (326-28). In Sostrata's and Canthara's reaction to his report, and in their plans about the course to be pursued, all the circumstances are revealed--that the lover had violently outraged the girl (306-8), that he had sworn that he would put his boy in his father's arms and implore his leave to marry her (332-34), that the girl has no dowry (345), that they have a witness in the ring that Aeschinus had dropped (347), that there has been no payment of money or anything else unbecoming the girl (349).

We may include here a scene which, though a monologue, is

Two devices which occur frequently and bear a certain resemblance to each other may be termed the dispute and the reproof. Under the dispute we may include a fairly large group of scenes which vary in emotional tone from a more or less placid discussion to a violent quarrel. In addition, the tone may change within the scene--a discussion may start on an unemotional basis and develop into a quarrel, such as, for example, takes place in Amphitruo 11. 2. Here Amphitruo arrives home anticipating a warm welcome from Alcmena, and leaves at the end of the scene angrily accusing her of unfaithfulness. In any dispute or argument there is an interchange of question and answer, accusation and defense, which may be utilized as an unobtrusive method of presenting pre-suppositions to the audience.

The reproof, which does not occur so frequently as the dispute, may also vary in tone from a mild rebuke to a virulent denunciation. A reproof, as a rule, produces a reaction. Accordingly it has two possibilities as an expository method--information may be conveyed by the reproof proper, or it may be presented in the defense stirred up by the reproof. An occasional example may be cited which might be classified as admonition rather than reproof, though obviously admonition, which looks to the future rather than to the past, is not so well adapted to expository uses.

The distinction between reproof and dispute is not always definite--an angry quarrel frequently involves denunciation on both sides, as occurs, for example, in the opening scene of the Mostellaria (1. 1). In the course of Grumio's angry denunciation

essentially a messenger speech. The true situation in regard to Philumena in the Hecyra is not revealed until Pamphilus appears (111. 2) from the house after seeing his wife and reports what he has learned (361-414)--that his wife is with child, that she had been outraged (382-84), and that this is the seventh month of their marriage. On the messenger in Roman comedy, see Wagner, De nuntiis comicis, Diss. (Vratislaviae, 1913), pp. 13 ff.

of Tranio's evil influence (cf. 27-28) he reveals all the facts necessary for the understanding of the action¹--that their master is abroad (25), that he is being eaten out of house and home (11-12), and that Tranio is demoralizing the son(21).

The Casina opens in the midst of a quarrel between Olympio and Chalinus. Each throws up to the other the fact that he is aware of what the other intends, and the audience is put in possession of essential facts--that Olympio, a villicus (98), is counting on capturing Casina, a serva (108), as his wife (94-96), while Chalinus, in turn dotes on her (107), and claims her as his promised bride (102).²

The interview between Calidorus, Pseudolus, and Ballio (Pseud. i. 3) is motivated by the request that Ballio should not dispose of Phoenicium for a few days, until Calidorus can raise some money (283-84). In the course of the argument that ensues considerable information is repeated, and some new details are added--Calidorus gave Ballio money as long as he had it (257); he had promised Ballio twenty minae for a certain day (279-80); Ballio has sold Phoenicium to a Macedonian Miles for twenty minae, and has already received fifteen (342, 345-46); Ballio had taken a solemn oath that he would sell the girl to no one save Calidorus (352-53).

¹Cf. Leo, Pl. F.², p. 194.

²Much the same motivation is used to present further pre-suppositions in later scenes of the Casina, after the action has begun. In the course of an argument between Cleostrata and Lysidamus (ii. 3) we gather the further information that Cleostrata is supporting Chalinus' suit, while Lysidamus is backing Olympio (254-58), that Cleostrata is acting in her son's interest (262-63), while Lysidamus is acting in his own (264-65). In the following scene (ii. 4), in which Lysidamus argues with Chalinus, it develops that Lysidamus had promised Casina to the villicus (288), while Cleostrata and her son had promised her to Chalinus (289). Furthermore, in the discussion which occurs in ii. 5 it appears (328, 339) that Olympio is acting on Lysidamus' behalf.

During the discussion between Antipho and his daughters (Stich. 1. 2), a scene which really serves to illustrate the situation as set forth in the preceding scene,¹ we learn incidentally that the girls' husbands had lost their money (132-34), and that Antipho, acting upon the advice of his friends, wishes to take them home (128); their husbands have been absent for three years (137).

The dialogue between Truculentus and Astaphium (Truc. 11. 1) serves to illustrate Astaphium's characterization of Truculentus in the previous scene (250-53),² and recapitulates some of the information given there. In the midst of their mutual abuse Truculentus reveals that he is aware of the escapades of his master's son, and of the fact that the garden wall loses a brick a night (296-304).³

¹On illustrative scenes, see p. 134, n. 1.

²On illustrative scenes, see p. 134, n. 1.

³Examples of the dispute-motivation for presenting pre-suppositions in deferred exposition (besides Cas. 11. 3, 4, 5 in note above) may be mentioned briefly.

Labrax and Charmides (Rud. 11. 6) enter in the midst of mutual abuse, and during the course of their argument as to who was to blame for the predicament in which they find themselves we learn certain details--that Charmides was responsible for their voyage, as he had assured Labrax of great profit from his courtesans in Sicily (540-41), that they have both lost their purses (545-48), that Labrax had received an earnest from Plesidippus for Palaestra (554-56). Several scenes later, in a quarrel between Labrax and Trachalio (111. 4), Trachalio throws up to Labrax the fact that Palaestrio was born at Athens of free parents (773-79), again revealing an important item.

An interesting example of the use of an argument to convey information is afforded by Phormio 11. 3. Geta and Phormio stage an abusive argument entirely for Demipho's benefit (cf. 352), which Demipho joins (373), after overhearing it for some little time (cf. 360). We are put in possession of some few details of the story told in court when Antipho was ordered to marry Phanium (361 ff.), and the device of the staged argument is just as effective as that of a genuine dispute.

Phaedria, Antipho, and Geta (Phor. 111. 2) engage in a dispute with Dorio, attempting to prevail upon him to wait a few days longer before selling Pamphila (cf. 489). In the course of the abuse which follows several facts are revealed--Dorio has sold Pamphila (510), Phaedria's friends have undertaken to raise the money for him within three days (512-14), Dorio has put up

An outstanding example of the use of reproof occurs in the *Trinummus*, in which the essential facts are disclosed in a dialogue scene (i. 2) between Callicles and Megaronides. The latter, the most trusted friend of Callicles (94), has come to reprove him (25-27) for a fault that has become a matter of common gossip (98-103). Constrained to defend himself, Callicles tells his friend the whole story of his accepting the guardianship of Charmides' children when the latter left for Seleucia, and explains the reason for his subsequent actions which have put him in a bad light in the eyes of those who do not know the facts.¹ Thus the device of reproof and defense motivates a complete exposition of the presuppositions and of the present situation.² Apocides (Epid. ii. 1) is reproofing Periphanes as they enter, and we learn that Periphanes has been considering marrying a poor woman of good family, who had borne him a daughter (168-72). Adelphasium, while reproofing Agorastocles (Poen. i. 2) for his

with Phaedria's promises for month after month (520-21), a day was once fixed upon which Phaedria was to pay Dorio, a day which has not yet arrived (523-25), the Miles has promised the money for tomorrow (531-32).

Arguments as to the identity of Menaechmus Sosicles motivate several scenes of the Menaechmi, and in two cases serve to acquaint the audience with certain details of the situation. Menaechmus Sosicles is mistaken by Cylindrus (ii. 2) for his brother, and in the course of the argument Menaechmus reveals that he has never previously set foot in Epidamnus (305-6). In the following scene (ii. 3) he is mistaken for his brother by Erotium, and he insists that he never had a wife, that he has never been to Epidamnus before, that he had lunch on board ship, and then landed (399-401). Erotium, to prove that she does know him, names his father, Moschus, and his native city, Syracuse (407-12), which Menaechmus admits to be correct (412).

The dispute between Onesimus and Syrisus (Epitr. 225 ff.) over the proper disposal of the ring included among the tokens leads to the revelation of the circumstances surrounding Charisius' loss of the ring at the festival.

¹For a similar case of reproof because of a false conception of the situation, cf. Ad. iii. 4, below, p. 167, n. 1.

²With this scene may be compared Heaut. i. 1 (above, p. 149), in which Chremes cloaks his curiosity, to a certain extent, by admonishing his neighbor. Compare especially 56-60, 78-79. The motivation of the Heaut. is complex.

inactivity (359), reveals that he has sworn a hundred times to obtain her freedom, and that while depending upon him she has nowhere obtained other resources for herself (359-63). Scapha (Most. 1. 3) reproves Philematium for her unbusinesslike methods, in the course of her rebuke showing that Philematium is desperately in love with Philolaches, and is keeping herself for him alone (188-89). Philematium, while defending herself, reveals that Philolaches has set her free with his own money (204).¹

In a few instances expository material is included in instructions to servants. In the cases cited the information is rarely of importance, but the device provides a natural method of presenting realistic detail. Hegio, upon his entrance (Capt. 1. 2),

¹This device is also used in deferred exposition. Laches (Hec. 11. 1) reproves Sostrata, and in the course of his rebuke incidentally reveals that he has been living in the country to save expenses (224-25), and also that Sostrata had been refused admission when she went to call on her daughter-in-law the day before (237). In the following scene (11. 2) Phidippus appears and Laches rebukes him for his attitude (cf. 249-52, etc.). He discloses that he had called on Phidippus the day before, but had received no satisfaction (251). Phidippus, in defending himself and in explaining his attitude, reports that it is not through his influence that Philumena refuses to return to her husband's home (cf. 265), but that Philumena of her own accord has refused to return during her husband's absence (267-69).

Hegio (Ad. 111. 4) reprimands Demea (cf. 462-64) for Aeschinus' misdeeds, and we learn all the facts of Pamphila's plight and Aeschinus' misconduct. Here Hegio's reproof is motivated, of course, by the false assumption that Aeschinus has deserted Pamphila for the music-girl (cf. 476-77; see also Trin. 1. 2, above, p. 166).

Mnesilochus (Bac. 111. 6) denounces Pistoclerus for his perfidy (cf. 538-39), and recapitulates the information that he had instructed Pistoclerus by letter from Ephesus to look up his mistress for him (560-61). Pistoclerus admits receiving it, and insists that he has found the girl (561). Melaenis, while upbraiding Alcesimarchus (Cist. 456 ff.), throws up to him his engagement to the rich Lemnian girl (492). Sophoclidisca (Pers. 11. 1), while chiding her mistress, discloses that her mistress is desperately in love (177). Mysis (And. 1. 5) mildly reproves Pamphilus by suggesting doubts as to his constancy and courage (cf. 269, 276-77, 281), and in defending himself he recalls the scene in which Chrysis entrusted Glycerium to his care (282-98), an account which provides some effective background information.

gives instructions to his lorarius, and we learn (110-11) that he had bought the captives yesterday from the quaestores de praeda; furthermore, in his explanation of where he is going, as he prepares to leave, we gather (126-27) that he has other prisoners at his brother's. Lysimachus (Merc. 11. 2) gives orders to a slave whom he is sending to the farm, and from the message he sends (279-80) we learn that his wife is in the country, and is not expecting to return immediately. Ballio (Pseud. 1. 2), during the course of his directions to his slaves, reveals the incidental information that this is his birthday (165). Panegyris (Stich. 1. 2) bids Crocotium summon Gelasimus, and we learn that it is Asia in which the girls' husbands have been staying; we also learn that a constant watch has been kept at the harbor (153-54).

The device of reminding a character of something which he already knows serves to bring forward facts which the audience does not as yet know. When properly used this device is a decidedly realistic expository method. Thus Philocrates (Capt. 11. 1) reminds Tyndarus (cf. 240) of their plan, and of the need for faithfulness and care, and it is revealed that they have exchanged rôles (224, 241, 244, 248); the information is emphasized by Tyndarus' repeating his instructions (249).¹

An effective method of presenting information in a casual

¹ Examples are found in deferred exposition. Thus Leonida (Asin. 11. 2) reminds Libanus of the Arcadian asses that the steward has sold to the merchant from Pella (333-34). Curculio (Curc. 1v. 2) reminds Cappadox that the girl's jewelry and clothes belong to the Miles (488-89); Lyco, in turn, reminds Cappadox of his promise that if the girl should be claimed as freeborn the money would be returned (490-92). Geta (Phor. 1. 4) reminds Phaedria of the plans they had laid earlier (224-26):

meministin, olim ut fuerit vostra oratio
in re incipiunda ad defendendam noxiam,
iustam illam causam, facilem, vincibilem, optumam?

and we gain an inkling of their original plot.

fashion may be termed comment. This usually occurs in dialogue, and consists of a remark induced by something that has just been said. Calidorus (Pseud. 1. 1), for example, commenting on the statement in the letter which Pseudolus is reading, that the matter was set for the next Dionysia (58-59), remarks (60) cras ea quidem sunt . . . , and thus shows that he is in imminent danger of losing his sweetheart. Libanus (Asin. 1. 1), when Demaenetus explains (82-83) that he is desirous that his son should have some money for his mistress, comments (84-86):

cupis id quod cupere te nequiquam intellego.
dotalem servom Sauream uxor tua
adduxit, cui plus in manu sit quam tibi--

a phase of the situation which the audience must understand.

Phaedromus (Curc. 1. 2), commenting on Palinurus' remark (142) that a man in love and out of cash is in a sorry plight, reveals (143-44) some hitherto undisclosed information: non ita res est, nam confido parasitum hodie adventurum cum argento ad me.¹

There remain instances in dialogue in which material of

¹For other examples illustrative of this technique, occurring in deferred exposition, see Amph. 667-70; Aul. 684-89; Poen. 900-904; Rud. 737-44; Eun. 359-60. The comment may also be given as an aside, or it may occur in a soliloquy, in which case it arises from something that is observed, or is suggested by something that has recently happened. Scepharnio (Rud. 1. 1), moved by the sight of the damage caused by the storm, remarks (83-84):

Pro di immortales, tempestatem quociusmodi
Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma.

Sosia (Amph. 1. 1) is surprised at the length of the night, and remarks (271-76) that Nocturnus must have gone to bed drunk--that the constellations are standing still, and there is no sign of day. A few lines later (287-88) he proceeds:

Ubi sunt isti scortatores, qui soli invitī cubant?
haec nox scita est exercendo scorto conducto male.

Mercury, in an aside, comments (289-90):

Meus pater nunc pro huius verbis recte et sapienter facit
qui complexus cum Alcumena cubat amans animo obsequens,
which serves to explain the whereabouts of Jupiter. Cf. also, in deferred exposition, Cist. 549-53; Most. 537-38; 560-61; And. 230.

varying degrees of expository importance is conveyed in ways which cannot be classified easily under specific heads. The common element in most of these cases is the casualness with which the information is presented. A statement, the ostensible purpose of which is the elucidation of a certain point, may put the audience in possession of information in regard to something entirely different. We may illustrate what we have in mind by an example. Curculio (Curc. ii. 3) is recounting the events of his trip to Caria. In the course of his description he says (340-41) that the Miles

. . . ibi me interrogat
ecquem in Epidauro Lyconem trapezitam noverim,

and the audience learns for the first time where the action of the piece is taking place.¹ The giving of information in this fashion may be termed incidental, or indirect, exposition. Obviously it is exposition of a most artistic sort.

The Stichus opens with an expository scene of unusual merit. The scene consists of conversation between the sisters, Panegyris and Pamphila, and we learn, gradually, the whole situation--that their husbands have been absent (3a-4) for three years (29-30), that they have heard nothing from them (31-32), that their father wishes them to leave their husbands (14-17), and that Panegyris does not regret the match (50-51). The scene begins with Panegyris' remark that Penelope must have been wretched during the absence of her husband, as they can realize from their own experience, since their husbands are also absent (1-6). The mention of the absent husbands leads Pamphila to a consideration of their immediate situation--their father is planning to separate them from their husbands (11-19). Panegyris, in an attempt to

¹See p. 41, n. 1.

comfort Pamphila, characterizes her father (20-26), and remarks that he is partially justified in his purpose, as their husbands have been gone three years (27-30), and they have had no news from them (31-33). The facts are given indirectly--that is, they are incidental to the main topic under discussion, their father's attitude.

An excellent instance of indirect exposition occurs in the dialogue between Plesidippus, Sceparnio, and Daemones (Rud. 1. 2). Plesidippus addresses Daemones as pater (103), and Sceparnio indulges in a decidedly feeble jest (104-5):

SCEP. sed utrum tu masne an femina es, qui illum patrem
voces? PLES. Vir sum equidem. SCEP. quaere, vir, porro patrem.

Daemones feels it necessary to explain the joke (106-7):

filiolam ego unam quam habui, eam unam perdidit,
virile sexus numquam ullum habui . . .

and in this casual fashion the audience is prepared for the recognition in the latter part of the play.¹

A few other instances may be indicated briefly. Gymnasium (Cist. 1. 1), while complimenting Selenium, reveals (10-11) that she and the Lena have just been entertained at luncheon.² Menaechmus (Men. 1. 2), in explaining where he is taking his wife's matle, designates Erotium as his mistress (171). Pyrgopolinices (Miles 1. 1) explains why he must be off (72 ff.), and we learn that he is in the service of King Seleucus. Philolaches (Most. 1. 3) discloses, in the course of amorous repartee with Philematium (292 ff.), that he paid thirty minae for her freedom (300). Callicles (Trin. 1. 2), addressing his wife within as uxor (40), automatically announces his matrimonial state. A few lines later, as he indulges in humorous repartee with Megaronides, the latter's remark (59) as to wives--vin commutemus, tuam ego ducam, et tu meam?--informs

¹See p. 87, n. 1.

²See p. 155, n. 1.

us of his status.¹

Information given in monologue.--Plausibility in giving information in monologue is, from the very nature of the case, more difficult to establish than in exposition by dialogue. The question of the motivation of the monologue as such does not concern us here, except very indirectly.² But when expository material is presented in monologue, especially when it takes the form of a more or less extended narration, difficulty arises in justifying the narrative. Obviously the majority of the devices which we have observed in use in dialogue scenes--the motivated question, the request for help, the argument, and others--are unavailable.

The device which is employed most extensively to introduce extended passages of exposition, as well as information of slighter importance, may be termed the application of a general principle. It is to be noted that this device occurs most frequently in monologues which are devoid of emotion or excitement. We shall consider a number of instances from early scenes of the plays.

The solo of Ergasilus (Capt. i. 1) provides an excellent example of the type. He appears with a stereotyped parasite-solo in which he glances at the hard lot of parasites in general, and takes his own case as an illustration (91)--quod mihi ne eveniat, non nullum periculum est; for his patron has been captured, the Aetolians are at war with the Eleans--this is Aetolia--Philopolemus, the son of Hegio, is a prisoner in Elis, and Hegio is buying

¹For other examples see Bac. 94, 101, 107; Capt. 169-70, 759-61; Epid. 173-74, 180, 365-68; Merc. 533, 536-36a; Most. 440-41; Poen. 191, 289-90; Rud. 91, 94-95, 128-30; Trin. 402-3; Heaut. 162; Eun. 165-69; Ad. 288-98. For examples in monologue see Aul. 63-65, 74-76, 275; Epid. 314-16; Miles 305, 350; Rud. 216-19; Stich. 416-17.

²For the motivation of monologues in comedy see Leo, Der Monolog, pp. 70 ff.; Legrand, Daos, pp. 412 ff., 537 ff.

up prisoners of war to affect an exchange (92-101). Thus a good deal of expository information is presented, but the awkwardness of the means employed is poorly disguised. The phrase (94) nam Aetolia haec est, e.g., strikes one as particularly unrealistic in a soliloquy of this sort.¹

Peniculus (Men. i. 1) enters with a parasite-solo, on the theme of the power of food and drink to bind a man to his patron. In illustrating the principle by his own situation (96 ff.) he discloses that he is a "bond-servant" of Menaechmus' (96-97), though there has been a gap in his invitations for some time (104).

Philolaches (Most. i. 2), in a song comparing a man to a new house into which moves a worthless tenant, applies the moral to himself, and incidentally reveals that he has been in love (142), and that his money, credit and good name have been lost (144-45).

Diniarchus (Truc. i. 1) indulges in a soliloquy (topical song) on lovers and the financial ruin into which they fall, and in considering his own case discloses that he has expelled the name of Phronesium from his breast (77-78), though he had been her first and foremost lover (79); she had banished Diniarchus after discovering a wealthier lover in the person of a Babylonian Miles (81-84), who is expected to arrive shortly from abroad (84-85); she is pretending to be brought to bed of a child by the Miles; for this reason she needs a supposititious child (85-88a); Diniarchus himself arrived at Athens day before yesterday from Lemnos, where he had gone on public service (91-92). A bit later in the same play (Truc. ii. 1) Astaphium introduces a

¹ Cf. Lessing, Sämt. Schriften (1886-1924), III, 97-98.

topical song on the policies of courtesans by a reference to Diniarchus, who has just left--her mistress is through with him, for his money is exhausted (213-14), but she still regards him as a friend, and speaks freely to him of her plans (215). At the end of her soliloquy, to illustrate the principle (244-45) that

semper datores novos oportet quaerere
qui de thesauris integris demus damunt

she discloses that there is now a generous young man from the country who, without the knowledge of his father, leapt over the garden wall last night and visited them (246-49).

Toxilus (Pers. 1. 1) enters with a brief soliloquy on the difficulties of a lover with an empty purse (cf. 1-2), in which he reveals that he is having a difficult time trying to raise a loan (5-6).

Lysidamus (Cas. 11. 3) sings a solo on love as a condiment, and in developing the theme in connection with the science of cooking applies it to himself, revealing incidentally that he is in love with Casina (225).

Demipho (Merc. 11. 1) soliloquizes on the ways in which the gods make sport of mortals (225), and after describing a dream he had had the night before attempts to interpret it as far as he can (252 ff.), revealing that he has been down at the harbor this morning, visiting his son's ship which arrived from Rhodes yesterday; there he fell in love with a girl whom his son had brought as a present for his mother (256-63).

Micio (Ad. 1. 1) muses on the anxieties of parenthood, and in the course of his soliloquy reveals his own situation--that he has adopted the elder of his brother's two sons, that he and his brother have lived diametrically opposed lives, and that they have opposing views on the rearing of children (40-59).

Davus (Phor. 1. 1) enters in the midst of a soliloquy on the unfair lot of slaves, and illustrates his point by the case of his friend Geta, incidentally revealing that the son of Geta's master has taken a wife (39-40). Clitipho (Heaut. 11. 1) ponders upon what unfair judges of young men fathers are (cf. 213), and upon what deaf ears their precepts encounter (222), and in using himself and Clinia as examples, reveals that while Clinia loves a virtuous girl (225-26), he himself has an extravagant (227) mistress (223), a recent affair, unknown to his father (229), and that he is without funds (228).¹

Information may be conveyed in the course of a monologue which, as a monologue, is motivated by emotion. A method commonly employed may be designated as an explanation of emotion. This method consists of an indication of emotion or feeling, and a statement as to the reason for it. The statement of the reason may convey essential information.

The Casina furnishes a good example. As Cleostrata (Cas. 11. 1) is leaving for a call upon her neighbor (145) Pardalisca reminds her (147) that her husband had told them to have luncheon ready for him. Cleostrata is annoyed, as is shown by her abrupt dismissal of Pardalisca, and by her remark (149-50): . . . neque paro neque hodie coquetur; she proceeds to give the reason for her annoyance, and we gather that her husband is engaging in a love-affair in opposition to herself and to their son (151-55):

quando is mi et filio advorsatur suo
animi amorisque caussa sui,
flagitium illud hominis! . . .

¹For other examples in deferred exposition see Aul. iv. 1 (cf. 603-4); Bac. 111. 12 (cf. 385-91); Cist. 11. 1 (cf. 206-10, 215 ff., 225-28); Ad. 11. 1 (cf. 196-97). There is an occasional occurrence of this technique in dialogue; cf. Capt. 1. 2 (142-45); Cist. 1. 1 (cf. 22 ff.); Hec. 1. 1 (cf. 58-62).

Gelasimus (Stich. 266 ff.) in a brief soliloquy reveals his surprise at his summons (266: demiror quid illaec me ad se arcessi iussint), and, as he continues, explains why he is surprised, incidentally stating a more or less essential fact (267-68)--

quae numquam iussit me ad se arcessi ante hunc diem
postquam vir abiit eius, miror quid siet . . .

Menaechmus (Men. 1. 2), after driving his wife away from the door (cf. 127), indulges in self-congratulation and reveals as the reason for his glee the fact that he has stolen a cloak of his wife's which he is going to give to a scortum (130). Thais, in a short soliloquy (Eun. 197-206) motivated by her sadness at Phaedria's misjudging her (cf. 197-98), defends herself to herself and reveals incidentally that she thinks she has discovered her ward's brother (202-4).¹

Information is occasionally conveyed incidentally under the guise of prayer, or of a greeting to his native land by a returned traveller.² Chrysalus (Bac. 11. 1), after a greeting to his native land (170-71) in which it is revealed that he has been in Ephesus for two years, addresses Apollo, and from his petition we learn that Pistoclerus and Mnesilochus are chums, that Mnesilochus' mistress is Bacchis, about whom Mnesilochus has sent Pistoclerus a letter, and that he wishes to avoid Nicobulus (172-77). Grumio (Most. 1. 1), in a fervent plea to the gods (77-81), discloses that his master has been gone three years, and that everything is going to wrack and ruin in his absence.³

¹Cf. also Miles 464-68; And. 1. 3; Eun. 507 ff.; Hec. 566 ff.; Ad. 252-77.

²On these motivations of monologue see Leo, Der Monolog, pp. 4, 7, 71; Legrand, Daos, p. 413.

³See also Stich. 111. 1 (404-5); Trin. iv. 1 (838-39); And. 1. 4 (232-33); cf. also Menander, frag. 13 (Koch).

There remain a few monologues containing expository material which may be described as reflections. There is usually no particular emotional stress, and the reflection, as a rule, is instigated by something that has happened in the previous scene. Chrysalus (Bac. 11. 2) indulges in a short monologue after the departure of Pistoclerus and pending the arrival of Nicobulus (229-34). The previous discussion (218 ff.) has dealt with the raising of money, and Chrysalus has assumed charge (cf. 227). Accordingly his thought (229), negotium hoc ad me attinet aurarium, leads naturally to the next (230-31)--

mille et ducentos Philippum attulimus aureos
Epheso, quos hospes debuit nostro seni

--a fact not mentioned before. Epidicus (Epid. 1. 1), in a transitional monody (81-103), after the exit of Thesprio, considers the situation (cf. 81: quo in loco haec res sit vides)--there is a great mass of misery about to topple down upon him unless he uses his strength. The consideration of his difficulties in general leads to thought of a specific one--he has cajoled the old man into believing he was buying his own daughter; what he did buy was a music girl for his own son, a girl Epidicus ' master loved and consigned to him when he left. If his master has brought back from the army another wench that has won his heart, Epidicus has lost his hide (87-91).

Pseudolus (Pseud. 1. 4), in a soliloquy (394-408) between the exit of Calidorus and the appearance of Simo and Callipho, ponders on his course of action (cf. 395-96). He mentions the necessity of obtaining twenty minae quae nunc nusquam sunt gentium (405). This apparently leads to the thought of the old man, which in turn leads to the thought that some time previously he had unsuccessfully attempted to swindle him (406-8):

atque ego me iam pridem huic daturam dixeram

et volui inicere tragulam in nostrum senem;
verum is nescioquo pacto praesensit prius.

Micio (Ad. i. 2), in a reflective soliloquy after the exit of Demea, ponders upon his brother's reproof (cf. 141), and admits that he is right, for Aeschimus does him no little wrong--his love-affairs have been innumerable, though recently he announced a desire to marry (149-51).¹

¹ The same technique occurs occasionally in deferred exposition. Cappadox (Curc. iv. 2) indulges in a brief soliloquy (527-32) after the exit of Lyco, who has promised him that he will receive his money tomorrow (527). Cappadox remarks, apropos of the transaction (528-31):

quando bene gessi rem, volo hic in fano supplicare,
nam eum qui mi illam vendidit numquam postilla vidi;
perisse credo. quid id mea refert? ego argentum habeo.

Thus we learn some of the circumstances in regard to his purchase of the girl. Trachalio (Rud. ii. 2) in a short soliloquy (324-30) after the exit of the Piscatores, ponders upon the perfidy of the leno--he had invited them here to breakfast (327), and then disappeared (326). Sostrata (Hec. ii. 3) in a soliloquy (274-80) on the unfair treatment which wives receive says (279) that she has always treated Philumena as her own daughter, a rather important fact. The statement is well motivated--she reflects upon how all wives suffer for the faults of a few (274-75); she herself is blameless in the present case, but it is hard to clear oneself, for they believe that all mothers-in-law are harsh (276-78); but she is not, for she has always treated the girl as her own daughter (278-79).

3. The Motivation of Entrances

One of the tasks of the dramatist at the opening of the play is the bringing upon the stage of the characters necessary for the early scenes; artistically it is essential that the playwright account for the presence of the character at that particular place and at that particular time; this is rendered comparatively difficult for, since the action has not got underway, the movement of the play itself does not contribute to the manipulation of characters. The ancient poet's problems are increased by the conventional stage-setting which requires that the action take place on the street; scenes which would naturally otherwise take place inside the house present especial difficulties of motivation when presented outdoors. The dramatist overcomes these difficulties, more or less effectively, by the use of various devices differing in their degree of naturalness. It is quite evident that the poet, in the early scenes of the play, paid considerable attention to this detail of technique; the number of unmotivated entrances is comparatively small.¹

The majority of motivated entrances occurring in the early scenes considered here² are accounted for by the use of a rela-

¹Studies of the motivation of entrance in general throughout the play have been made by Polczyk, De unitatibus et loci et temporis in nova comoedia observatio, Diss. (Breslau, 1909); Brasse, Quatenus in fabulis Plautinis et loci et temporis unitatibus species veritatis negligatur, Diss. (Gryph., 1914); Harms, De introitu personarum in Euripidis et novae comoediae fabulis, Diss. (G8tt., 1914); a complete study of the question has been made in an unpublished University of Chicago Ph. D. dissertation by E. W. Delcamp, "The Motivation of Entrance in Roman Comedy" (1923).

²In this chapter we shall limit ourselves to the scenes discussed in the chapter on "The Structure of the Scenes and the Choice of Characters for Expository Purposes"; see above, p. 93.

tively small number of devices. One of the most obvious is that of the errand, whether the character leaves the house, or arrives before it. The cocus Cylindrus (Men. 1. 4), whose presence is desired for the initial confusion between the Menaechi in 11. 2, is introduced by being sent to market by Erotium (218-19). Panegyris (Stich. 1. 2) calls to Crocotium to fetch Gelasimus (150-54); this motivates Crocotium's appearance in the following scene. Astaphium (Truc. 1. 2) remarks (114) that she has been sent to fetch "himself"; considerably later (246 ff.), after the interruption caused by her encounter with Diniarchus, and after her own monologue, we learn that she is actually on her way to see one of Phronesium's lovers. Grumio (Most. 1. 1) has come in from the farm for fodder (62). Pyrgopolinices (Miles 1. 1) is on his way to the forum with his train to pay the recruits he enlisted the day before (72-74). Ballio (Pseud. 1. 2) comes out of the house, primarily to admonish his slaves (cf. 150) as to their conduct in his absence, as he himself is starting for the forum to buy fish (163, 169). Phidippus (Hec. 11. 2) is called to the forum by business (273). Adelphasium and Anterastilis (Poen. 1. 2) are on their way to the temple of Venus to perform the rites of the Aphrodisia (263-64).

There are three early entrances which differ from the preceding examples only in that the errand was undertaken before the play began; in these instances, then, the entering character, instead of starting on the errand, is returning from it. Simo and Sosia, his libertus (And. 1. 1) are just returning from market (cf. 28 ff.), and pause before the door while Simo, under the guise of giving instructions, outlines the situation. Demipho (Merc. 11. 1) had gone down to the harbor early in the morning to transact some business (cf. 255 ff.) and is obviously returning

home. Syrus and Dromo (Heaut. 11. 3) had been sent to bring Clinia's mistress (cf. 175-76, 191, 238 ff.), and are coming back from their errand.¹

Frequently characters appear looking for someone; we may call this the search. Geta (Phor. 1. 2) enters from the house looking for Davus, who has just arrived (52). Clitipho (Heaut. 1. 2) comes out in search of his father (179), for whom he has news. The Cocus (Curc. 11. 2) appears, looking for Palinurus, to hurry him up about his task (251-53). Daemones (Rud. 1. 2) enters from the house, calling for Sceparnio (97), to give him orders concerning his work (100-102), and is thus made available for the dialogue with Plesidippus which follows. Philto (Trin. 11. 2) has come out to find Lysiteles (276), in compliance with a previous request for an interview (cf. 324).

There are three early entrances in which the search-motive is used, but which have in addition an overtone of anxiety which adds to the naturalness of the appearance. Micio (Ad. 1. 1) enters, calling "Storax" (1); upon receiving no reply he concludes that Aeschinus did not come home from the dinner of the previous evening, nor any of the slaves who had gone to meet him (1-2). It is thus apparent that he is worried about the non-appearance of his adoptive son, and this worry motivates both his entrance and his monologue. Similarly Clinia (Heaut. 11. 2) is worried about

¹The mechanical nature of this device of the errand is self-evident. In none of the instances cited, with the exception of Heaut. 11. 3, does the errand undertaken have any particular connection with the action. They are simply transparent excuses for bringing a character on the scene. The device is useful, however, in that, excepting the case in which the character is already returning from an errand, it can be used to bring a character on the stage, justify his exit, and prepare for his return later on in the play.

The device of the errand occurs in the extant fragments of Menander; cf. Samia 65 ff., 184 ff.; Peri. 52 ff., 61 ff., 164 ff.; Georg. 35 ff.

the delay in the return of the messengers with his mistress (cf. 230-31), and comes out of the house to see whether they are in sight, in spite of the fact that it is to his best interests to stay under cover (cf. 235). Thais (Eun. 1. 2) is anxious lest Phaedria is offended (81-83), and since she had asked him to call (cf. 46 ff.), it is clear that her anxiety has caused her to come out to look for him.

The device of the search is also used in the case of characters entering by the street. Chrysalus (Bac. 11. 1) enters, returning from abroad, looking for Pistoclerus (175-76); Acanthio (Merc. 1. 2) runs in, in a burlesque hurry to find Charinus (112, 128); these two scenes are similar in that both slaves have important information to divulge. Plesidippus (Rud. 1. 2) has come to look for the leno (91, 94) who had said that he intended to perform a sacrifice to Venus (94-95). Demes (Ad. 1. 2) has come in search of Micio to reprove him for his son's conduct (81 ff.).¹

Another device, somewhat overlapping, perhaps, those previously discussed, is the call; this may be considered to include calls both for social and for business purposes. Hegio (Capt. 1. 2) is on his way to his brother's, for a look at his other prisoners (126-27). Cleostrata (Cas. 11. 1) is going to call on Myrrhina and tell her her troubles (145, 160); in the following scene (11. 2) Myrrhina appears, announcing to her servants that she is going to call on Cleostrata--that she becomes so sleepy when she works by herself (162-67); thus they meet on the stage. Gymnasium and the Lena (Cist. 1. 1), who had been invited to luncheon (9-11), are just appearing from the house with their hostess, Selenium, who is seeing them off. Menaechmus (Men. 1. 2) appears

¹For instances of this device in Menander see Epitr. 16; Samia 142 ff.

on his way to see Erotium (124). Antipho (Stich. 1. 2) is going to pay a call upon his elder daughter (66); his leaving home, however, has a further motivation, for, as he enters, he gives stinging orders to his slaves to give the house a thorough cleaning; this in itself would be sufficient explanation of his exit.¹ Phaedria (Eun. 1. 1) is going to call on Thais, in answer to a summons (46-47).

The same device is also used in the case of characters entering from the street. Ergasilus (Capt. 1. 1) is going to call on Hegio (107-8); Peniculus (Men. 1. 1) is going to call on Menaechnus (96 ff.); Saturio (Pers. 1. 2) is coming from the baths (cf. 90-91) for a call upon Toxilus (77 ff.); all three parasites have come in hope of a meal. Callidamates and Delphium (Most. 1. 4) are coming to visit Philolaches on the chance of obtaining a drink (317). Phaedromus (Curc. 1. 1) is on his way to the leno's house, for a clandestine meeting with his sweetheart (1-3, 32 ff.). Megaronides (Trin. 1. 1) is on his way to call on Callicles to reprove him for his actions (25-27). Diniarchus (Truc. 1. 1), as can be inferred from his questions (188, 189, 193, 205), has come to call on Phronesium. Davus (Phor. 1. 1) is coming to see Geta and repay a loan (35-38). Philotis and Syra (Hec. 1. 1) are just returning from a visit to Bacchis (97-98). A weak motivation of this type occurs in the opening scene of the Stichus (1. 1); as can be gathered from the following scene (cf. 66, 147), Pamphila is calling upon Panegyris.²

¹A very similar motivation occurs in Pseud. 1. 2, in which Ballio, who is going to market (163, 169), gives similar instructions to his slaves.

²Three examples may be cited from Menander. Smicrines, at the opening of the Epitrepontes (Membr. Petr. 1), has come to call upon his daughter (cf. 25 ff.). Syrisus (Epitr. Cair. D. 1) is on his way to make his payment to his landlord, Chaerestratus (cf. 159 ff.). The youth in the opening scene of the Georgos is undecided whether to call at the house of Myrrhina or not (cf. 17 ff.).

A very effective method of getting a necessary character on the stage is the summons; someone already present on the stage calls a character, or characters, out of the house; the appearance of the summoned character is thus fully accounted for. Phaedromus (Curc. 1. 2) summons Leaena from the house (80-81, 88 ff.), and she in turn sends out Planesium (158-59). Palinurus (Curc. 11. 2) calls Phaedromus (276), who is inside, out of the house to meet Curculio. Menaechmus (Men. 1. 2) has Peniculus call out Erotium (178), and she in turn calls out Cylindrus (218). Grumio (Most. 1. 1) enters in a temper and calls loudly for Tranio (1-5), who appears from the kitchen.¹ Milphio (Poen. 1. 1) summons Agorastocles (205) when he sees Adelphasium and Anterastilis approaching. Ballio (Pseud. 1. 2) summons forth his Lorarii and Meretrices (133-34). Hegio (Capt. 1. 2) brings out his Lorarius, giving him directions as he does so (cf. 110 ff.). Astaphium (Truc. 11. 2) knocks at the door and Truculentus appears (256). A little later Phronesium comes out to meet Diniarchus in response to Astaphium's summons at Diniarchus' request (cf. 329 ff.).²

The summons is not utilized to the fullest extent, however, as in several instances³ a character on the stage announces that he is going to summon someone, but before he can carry out his intention the desired character appears from the house. For example, Ergasilus (Capt. 1. 1) remarks (108), after a short characterization of Hegio, nunc ad eum pergam. sed aperitur ostium . . . ; Hegio appears with his Lorarius, and proceeds to give him

¹ It is possible that Grumio may have been forcibly ejected from the kitchen, rather than that he enters from the street; cf. Polczyk, op. cit., p. 23.

² For this device in Menander cf. Epitr. 641 ff.; Peri. 328 ff.

³ Capt. 1. 1; Cas. 11. 1, 2; Men. 1. 1; Pers. 1. 2; Trin. 11. 3; Eun. 1. 1; Phor. 1. 1; cf. Menander Peri. 431-32.

directions; at 129 Ergasilus comes forward, and dialogue with Hegio begins. This obviously leads to the necessity of motivating the appearance of the entering character, which would have been avoided if the caller's intention had been carried out. From an examination of these examples it is to be noted that in some cases¹ considerable time elapses between the entrance of the character who was about to be summoned and his noticing the presence of his caller. The poet evidently finds this a convenience in introducing the one who enters from the house, or in presenting material unconnected with the caller. Thus when Hegio (Capt. i. 1) enters with his Lorarius and gives him instructions, the way is paved for the scene (ii. 1) between the Lorarius and the Captives. Peniculus (Men. i. 1) is about to call Menaechmus (108-9) when the latter appears from the house in the midst of an argument with his wife; this serves to characterize Menaechmus and to point his domestic situation. Philto (Trin. ii. 3) is going to call out Lesbonicus (400-401) when Stasimus and Lesbonicus appear. They reveal some essential facts before they see Philto. Thus in these cases the opportunity afforded the dramatist would be lost if the avowed purpose of the caller were carried out. Individual reasons may be found for the other instances in which the caller does not carry out his intention of calling out the one whom he desires to see. Davus (Phor. i. 1) has come to find Geta to repay a debt (4) when, in the midst of his monologue, Geta appears on his way to the forum (149-50); this serves to remove the latter from the stage at the end of the scene so that he is available to report the news of his master's arrival some little time later (i. 4). Toxilus (Pers. i. 3) comes out (apparently to look for Saturio--cf. 83) just as Saturio is about to go in (77-80); he pretends not

¹Capt. i. 1; Men. i. 1; Trin. ii. 3.

to see Saturio for some time, meanwhile giving directions to an imaginary cook within; clearly the reason for his appearance here before he is summoned is to provide the amusing episode of 81-101. Phaedria (Eun. 1. 1) has come to see Thais in answer to her summons (46-47); but before he makes his presence known Thais appears (81) looking for him; here the device emphasizes both Phaedria's hesitation and indecision, as well as Thais' anxiety to see him. Finally, Myrrhina's appearance (Cas. 11. 2) serves both to make her interview with Cleostrata on the street seem more natural, as well as to point (166-68) the intimacy between the two women and to motivate their conspiracy later on in the play.

A motivation used several times in cases of entrance from the street is that of the returning or arriving traveller. Sosia (Amph. 1. 1) appears on his way from the harbor; he has been sent ahead by his master (163-64b) to give the news to Alcmena (195). Similarly Thesprio (Epid. 1. 1) is returning from a campaign and has been sent ahead by his master to the house of Chaeribulus (15-16, 21, 67-69); in the following scene (1. 2) Thesprio's master, Stratippocles, arrives on his way to Chaeribulus' home (69). Chrysalus (Bac. 11. 1) enters with an address to his native land, revealing that he is returning from a trip, and is anxious to see Pistoclerus (175-76). Curculio (Curc. 11. 3) arrives home from Caria (cf. 67-68, 206-7), anxious to report to Phaedromus (cf. 301-2). Menaechmus Sosicles and Messenio (Men. 11. 1) have just landed in Epidamnus and are coming from the harbor (226-31); this example differs from the previous instances in that they are arriving in a strange town, and not returning home; thus their destination at the moment is vague. Obviously the use of this motivation is conditioned by the circumstances of the plot, but where it can be used it is a realistic device.

An explanation used occasionally may be termed the pursuit. Lydus (Bac. 1. 2) has been following Pistoclerus to see what he is about with his load of provisions (109-10). Chalinus (Cas. 1. 1) has followed Olympio to prevent himself from being tricked (91-96). Epidicus (Epid. 1. 1) has been trying to catch up with Thesprio, of whom he caught sight at the harbor (14). This device, also, produces a fairly natural motivation.

There remains a group of entrances which can scarcely be classified with the preceding divisions, and which bear slight resemblance to one another. Euclio (Aul. 1. 1) drives Staphyla violently from the house, and follows her out, continuing his abuse;¹ it is incidentally revealed (40-41) that Staphyla has been snooping around, and Euclio suspects her of looking for his gold (63); thus the presence of each is accounted for in a realistic manner. Argyrippus (Asin. 1. 2) has been driven out of the house of Cleareta (cf. 127), and rages about his treatment.² In the next scene (Asin. 1. 3) Cleareta comes out to continue the argument with Argyrippus. Olympio (Cas. 1. 1) is seeking solitude for thought (89-90).³ Cappadox (Curc. 11. 1) appears from the temple, after his incubatio, since it is now morning (61-62, 203-4, 216 ff.). Philematium and Scapha (Most. 1. 3) come from the bath to complete Philematium's toilet (157-58, passim); she is awaiting a visit from Philolaches (cf. 166-67, 248-49). Agorastocles (Poen. 1. 1) is on his way to the temple of Venus to treat himself to an inspection of the meretrices (190-92). Sceparnio (Rud.

¹Cf. the flight of Chrysis from the house with Niceratus in pursuit, Samia 223 ff.

²If Grumio (Most. 1. 1) is thrown out of the house (see above), the case is similar.

³Similarly, privacy is sought on the street in Aul. 133-34; perhaps this is tacitly the case in Trin. 11. 2 (cf. 324-25); in general see Legrand, Daos (1910), pp. 445 ff.

1. 1) comes out to dig clay to repair the roof which was damaged by the storm of the preceding night (96). Palaestra (Rud. 1. 3) has been washed ashore by the waves after the shipwreck, and appears seeking help (cf. 160 ff.). Menedemus (Heaut. 1. 1) is found at the opening of the scene working in the field (cf. 67-69, 88); his explanation of his continuous toil (cf. 138 ff.) explains his labor on the present occasion. Parmeno (Hec. 1. 2) appears from the house, giving directions that if his master inquires for him he has gone to the harbor to see about Pamphilus' arrival (76-77); but if his master doesn't inquire, he'll have the excuse for another time (78-80); thus it is evident that he is going off on some affair of his own which he does not care to reveal (cf. 194). Tyndarus and Philocrates (Capt. 11. 1) come out in charge of the Lorarius;¹ in the following scene we learn from Hegio's remark as he enters (252) that he had ordered the Captives to be taken out of the house; he does not explain, however, his reason for doing so.²

There are three plays in which the prologue is spoken by a character of the play, who remains upon the stage for the following scene. It is interesting to observe that even here some explanation, at least, of the reason for the character's presence is included. Mercury (Amph.) introduces himself, and explains that he has come at the bidding of Jupiter to plead for a fair hearing (cf. 17 ff.). Charinus (Merc. 1. 1) announces that he intends to do two things--to explain the argument of the play,

¹ In the opinion of some scholars Tyndarus and Philocrates remain upon the stage continuously from their first entrance; cf. Leo, Pl. F.², pp. 203-4. The question is fully discussed, with bibliography, by Delcamp, op. cit., p. 94, n. 5.

² Because of the fragmentary beginning of the Bacchides, the motivation of the presence of the Bacchides and Pistoclerus (Bac. 1. 1) is not clear.

and to tell of his amores (cf. 1 ff.). Palaestrio, who appears with a deferred prologue (Miles 11. 1), is going to announce the play, and give the argument (cf. 79 ff.).¹

Unmotivated Entrances.--A comparatively small number of scenes occur in which the presence of a character is not motivated at all, or in which the motivation is too slight to be determined definitely. These may be divided into three groups: (a) the entrance of a single character; (b) the entrance of two characters together with the presence of neither motivated; and (c) the entrance of two characters together with the presence of one motivated.²

(a) The entrance of a single character.

Palinurus (Curc. 11. 1) comes out of the house, speaking to Phaedromus within, and dialogue with Cappadox follows; the motive for Palinurus' entrance is not made clear.³ Callicles (Trin. 1. 2) enters from the house, before being summoned by Megaronides who has come to see him (cf. 25-27), giving directions to his wife within as he appears; he does not state why he is leaving the house or where he is going. Similarly Pistoclerus (Bac. 11. 2) comes on the stage from the house of Bacchis, addressing a remark to Bacchis within as he comes out (178-80), and enters into conversation with Chrysalus, who has just arrived from abroad; no reason is advanced for his appearance. Chremes (Heaut. 1. 1)

¹This type of explanation of presence is also found in prologues which are not spoken by a character in the play; cf. Asin. 6 ff.; Rud. 31; of course such explanations are purely mechanical, and are not "motivations" in the sense in which we have been using the term.

²Helen Rees Clifford, "Dramatic Technique and the Originality of Terence," Class. Jour., XXV (1930-31), 605-18, remarks (p. 608) that unmotivated appearances most frequently occur in cases of dual entrance.

³Cf. Conrad, "The Role of the Cook in Plautus' Curculio," Class. Phil., XIII (1918), p. 391.

strikes up a conversation with Menedemus, who is working in the field; we are left in the dark as to where Chremes comes from, or just why he is present. He feels it to be his duty to admonish Menedemus (cf. 56 ff.), but it is not clear whether this was the sole reason for his appearance or not.

In the remaining examples of the unmotivated entrance of a single character which we shall consider, the character enters with a monologue. Davus (And. 1. 2) comes out of the house (cf. 174: foras) and enters into conversation with Simo, who is already present; there is no explicit indication of the reason for his appearance. However, it is clear from his entering soliloquy (175-78, 180-83) that he is anxious about the situation, and this expression of emotion may have been intended to serve as a justification of his entrance.¹ Philolaches (Most. 1. 2) appears with a topical song; it is evident in the following scene (1. 3) that Philematium is adorning herself for his approval (cf. 166-67, 248-49), and we may perhaps assume that he has come out to wait for her; but there is no explicit motivation. The entrance of

¹Certain analogous entrances, occurring in non-expository scenes, which are unmotivated, or in which emotion is intended to serve as a motivation, may be compared. Periphanes (Epid. iii. 2), e.g., comes out of the house for no stated reason, but apparently he is anxiously awaiting the return of Apocides (cf. 394-95). Anger and indecision motivate the entrance of Charinus (And. iv. 1). Alcmena (Amph. iii. 2), as she definitely states (cf. 882 f.), is so angry at her husband that she cannot remain indoors. Alarm drives Myrrina (Hec. iv. 1) out of the house. Similarly Onesimus (Epitr. 494 ff.) avowedly leaves the house through fear of his master (517 ff.); cf. also Samia 296 ff. Onesimus (Epitr. 202 ff.) enters with a monologue motivated by worry as to his course of action. The beginning of Demeas' monologue (Samia 1 ff.) is fragmentary, but apparently the excitement aroused by his discovery of the true situation has driven him out of the house for relief.

Two other unmotivated entrances in Menander may be mentioned, though in neither is any marked emotion present. Onesimus (Epitr. 165 ff.) comes out of the house remarking on the slowness of the cook, sees Syrus and his wife, and joins the conversation; Moschion (Samia 271 ff.) appears pondering upon his situation and his course of action; no reason is given for either entrance.

Lysiteles (Trin. ii. 1) is very similar; he comes out of the house (cf. 276) without explanation of his entrance, and sings a topical song until the arrival of Philto, with whom dialogue begins; we may perhaps consider that Lysiteles' appearance is explained by the statement in the next scene (ii. 2) that he had requested a conference with his father (324-25), but the motivation is slight.¹ Toxilus (Pers. i. 1) enters with a short monologue, inspired by his low spirits due to his failure to raise a loan (5-6), upon the difficulties of a lover with an empty purse; he does not reveal where he is going, nor why he is there. In the same scene his friend, Sagaristio, arrives with a short monologue on the duties of the faithful slave;² again we do not know where he is go-

¹On Most. i. 2 and Trin. ii. 1 (see above, p. 97) Bickford, Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy, Diss. (Princeton, 1922), includes in a group which he calls "topical-rhetorical monologues," these two monologues, as well as Bac. 925 ff., and Pseud. 574 ff. (pp. 11-12). In the Bacchides Chrysalus announces his plans for further trickery, and develops a very elaborate comparison between his forthcoming operations and the siege of Troy. He has apparently come out of the house to await the appearance of Nicobulus (cf. 932, 935-36). In the Pseudolus, Pseudolus rejoices over his present success, and, like Chrysalus, announces his intention of overcoming his adversary, developing a military metaphor. His entrance is entirely unmotivated. Thus, in three out of the four examples of elaborate topical monologues, no motivation of entrance is supplied; the motivation of the fourth is quite artificial.

²The monologue of the faithful slave is a conventional device for bringing on a character speaking; it is commonly used when the entering slave is being introduced, as here, or when he is loosely attached to the preceding action, and the poet has difficulty in finding anything more organic for him to say. The Lyconidis Servus (Aul. iv. 1) is introduced late in the play to begin a new phase of the action, and moralizes upon his devotion to duty; in the course of his monologue, however, he explains why he has come (cf. 605). Messenio (Men. v. 6), who has had no part in the action since he was sent to the tavern with orders to return before sunset (cf. 435-37), enters with a similar monologue; he explains where he has been and why he returns (cf. 986-87). Phaniscus (Most. iv. 1), who, like Messenio, was dismissed early in the play with orders to come back later (cf. 313 ff.), enters admiring his own uprightness; he explains why he comes (cf. 874 ff.). Harpax (Pseud. iv. 7), who has been waiting at the tavern since ii. 2 (cf. 658 ff.), congratulates himself upon his devotion to his master, and explains why he returns (cf. 1116 ff.). It should be observed that in all these instances the reason for

ing or why he is present, though it may perhaps be deduced (cf. 11-12) that he is on an errand for his master; if he had any, however, he has apparently forgotten it by the end of the scene. Gelasimus (Stich. 1. 3) enters with a typical parasite's solo,¹ without giving any indication of the reason for his coming; it is clear that he is not coming for a meal--the usual motivation of a parasite's entrance--for (266-68) he is much surprised at Panegyris' summons.² Lysidamus (Cas. 11. 3) enters, apparently on his way home, and without any explanation as to where he has been.³ He soliloquizes upon the power of love, and upon what a gay dog he is, until he sees his wife; then dialogue begins. He resists all his wife's efforts to find out where he has been and what he has been doing. Thus the omission of a clear explanation is probably intentional; it is obvious that he has been in some mischief, and the entertainment of the scene depends largely upon his efforts to conceal his philandering.⁴

the character's entrance is given definitely, in contrast to the case of Sagaristio (Pers. 1. 1) discussed above.

¹On parasite solos, see p. 116, n. 2.

²Upon the implicit motivation of Gelasimus' appearance, see Prescott, "The Interpretation of Roman Comedy," Class. Phil., XI (1916), 136-37.

³Preparation for his appearance is made earlier, for we learn (147) that he expects to be home for lunch.

⁴It is interesting to note that in the seven unmotivated entrances discussed above in which characters enter with monologue, six of the monologues consist of topical discourses. This may perhaps be taken as indicating that the poet considered that an entrance with a topical discussion made it relatively unnecessary to provide a definite explanation of the character's presence. However, instances of entrance with such a monologue in which a definite motivation is included are much more numerous than the cases of unmotivated entrance. In addition to the six unmotivated entrances above, there are, in the scenes included in the present discussion of motivation (excluding monologues in which, as, e.g., in that of Sosia (Amph. 1. 1), a topos may be introduced incidentally (cf. 166-75)) ten entrances with topical discourses (Capt. 69; Men. 77; Merc. 225; Pers. 53; Rud. 185; Trin. 23; Truc. 22, 98; Phor. 35; Ad. 26) in all of which a definite reason for the character's appearance is advanced, or clearly implied. In the plays as a whole I have observed fifty-two entrances of characters

- (b) The entrance of two characters with the presence of neither motivated.

Libanus (servus) and Demaenetus (senex) come on together in an expository scene (Asin. i. 1); this, perhaps, is not an entirely clear case of unmotivated entrance, although there is no direct explanation of their appearance. Toward the end of the scene Demaenetus decides to go to his banker's in the forum and await developments (cf. 108, 116, 125-26); Libanus is going off to lay his plans (cf. 115), but refuses to divulge his destination (cf. 110 ff.); it is not clear, however, that either Libanus or Demaenetus had any destination in mind when they entered, and no reason is given for their coming on together. The situation is somewhat similar in the case of the first entrance of Stratippocles and Chaeribulus in the Epidicus (i. 2). We have been led to expect the eventual appearance of Stratippocles by Thespricio's report in the previous scene (cf. 67 ff.) that Stratippocles, in order to avoid his father, intended to go to Chaeribulus' house; no explanation as to how Stratippocles and Chaeribulus met, however, is given; at the end of the scene their decision to celebrate the day inside the house of Chaeribulus (157-58) is apparently a spontaneous idea (cf. Chaeribulus' question (157): quid hic nunc agimus?). Apocides and Periphanes (Epid. ii. 1) enter in the midst of a conversation; there is no indication of where they come from, or why they enter. Pseudolus (servus) and Calidorus (adulescens) enter together in a scene (Pseud. i. 1) obvi-

with topical monologues. Excluding the sixteen examples already mentioned, thirty-six occur in later scenes; of these, twenty-nine entrances are explained, or definitely prepared for, while seven are not. Thus it is obvious that the proportion of unexplained entrances of this sort is much greater in the early scenes of the play, probably due to the greater difficulty which the poet experiences in providing a satisfactory introduction of characters in the exposition. It is clear, then, that as a general thing a topical discourse is not considered, per se, a sufficient motivation of entrance.

cusly devised for expository purposes; no explanation whatever is given for their appearance. In Stich. 1. 1 the two wives are found upon the stage at the opening of the play, discussing their sad lot; no definite explanation of their presence is given.¹ Two cases occur in the scenes of Terence already considered. Antipho and Phaedria (adulescentes--Phor. 1. 3) enter with nothing to indicate where they come from or why they are there.² Laches and his wife, Sostrata, appear (Hec. 11. 1), and Laches proceeds to blame their son's marital difficulties upon her; there is nothing to show why they come out; Laches, to be sure, leaves some time later (273) for the forum, but there is no evidence that he had this in mind when he came on; he simply decided to accompany Phidippus (273: eo tecum una).

- (c) The entrance of two characters together with the presence of one motivated.

The examples in the third group bear a certain similarity to one another in that the unmotivated character is a slave, or (Miles) a parasite. In Poen. 1. 1 Agorastocles (adulescens) and Milphio (servus) enter; Agorastocles is on his way to the temple of Venus (190); no reason, however, is given for the presence of Milphio. Likewise (Eun. 1. 1) Phaedria (adulescens) and his slave, Parmeno, appear; Phaedria has come in answer to Thais' summons (1-2, 101); here again there is no explanation of Parmeno's presence. Three other cases may be compared, though in these instances the pairs of characters are so closely connected that perhaps no explanation is necessary. In Curc. 1. 1 Phaedromus (adulescens) is paying a night call upon his sweetheart, incidentally to carry

¹However, see above, p. 183.

²Reidel, "The Dramatic Structure of Terence's Phormio," CW, XI (1917), 26, considers this the only unmotivated entrance in the play.

out a vow he has made to offer a laientaculum to Venus (72); he is accompanied by Palinurus (servus); the scene is largely expository, as the situation is revealed by Phaedromus' replies to Palinurus' questions; no reason is given for the slave's presence, but obviously he is part of the train (cf. 75, 83) following Phaedromus. Menaechmus Sosicles and his slave, Messenio (Men. 11. 1), have just arrived at Epidamnus and are on their way from the harbor (226-30); here Messenio is clearly Menaechmus' traveling companion and his presence is natural. In Miles 1. 1 the soldier is accompanied by his parasite, Artotrogus, whose presence is not definitely motivated; the explanation given for Palinurus' presence (Curc. 1. 1) holds here, as Artotrogus is apparently considered as part of the Miles' train (cf. 78).

It may be noted from the discussion above that when a slave (or parasite) is one of two characters entering together no particular attempt is made to motivate his presence. This may be due to the fact that a slave accompanying his master is regarded as such a natural circumstance that the dramatist feels under no necessity of explaining his appearance. Thus in Curc. 1. 1 and Miles 1. 1 the slave and the parasite are members of the trains accompanying Phaedromus and the Miles, and their presence is sufficiently explained. Likewise (Men. 11. 1) Messenio is obviously Menaechmus' traveling companion. In the remaining cases (Asin. 1. 1; Pseud. 1. 1; Poen. 1. 1; Eun. 1. 1) there is no such additional explanation. Twice (Stich. 1. 1; Hec. 11. 1) the presence of the pairs on the street is clearly due to the conventional stage-set; the discussion which takes place on the street would naturally be held within the house, and the dramatist has either neglected, or not considered it necessary, to provide a definite

reason for their appearance outside.¹

There remain to be considered the ways in which the reason for the character's presence is given. As is obvious, some of the devices are clear from their very nature. Thus the fact that a character appears when summoned from the house needs no elaboration in the subsequent dialogue; the same is true when a slave is sent upon an errand by his master. When, however, a character appears without such an introduction, an explanation is necessary; this can be given either by explicit statement in monologue or dialogue, or can be inferred either from what is said, or from the action itself.

The explanation of the presence of a character, made by himself, varies in fullness of detail. Thus Sosia (Amph. 1. 1) reveals in his entering monologue that he has just returned (161), and that his master has sent him ahead from the harbor (163-64b) to take the news to his wife (195). Ergasilus (Capt. 1. 1), on the other hand, simply announces in his parasite-solo his intention (108) of calling upon Hegio.² Thesprio (Epid. 1. 1), whose situation closely resembles that of Sosia in the Amphitruo, reveals in dialogue, in reply to Epidicus' questions, that he is returning from a campaign (15-16, 21), and that he has been sent ahead to Chaeribulus' house to await his master's arrival (66-68). With greater brevity Demea's presence (Ad. 1. 2) is explained by

¹It is interesting to observe that of the instances of unmotivated entrance considered, omitting those in which the accompanying slave or parasite is the only unmotivated character, nine (Asin. 1. 1; Most. 1. 2; Pers. 1. 1; Pseud. 1. 1; Stich. 1. 1, 3; Trin. 11. 1; Phor. 1. 3; Hec. 11. 1) occur when characters come upon an empty stage. Of these, four (Asin. 1. 1; Pers. 1. 1; Pseud. 1. 1; Stich. 1. 1) are the opening scenes of the play.

²For other examples of explicit statement in monologue cf. Bac. 11. 1; Curc. 11. 1; Men. 1. 1, 2; Merc. 11. 1; Pers. 1. 1; Stich. 1. 3; And. 1. 5; Phor. 1. 1.

his abrupt remark as he enters (81): Ehem, opportune: te ipsum quaerito. Ballio (Pseud. 1. 2), in the midst of his instructions to his household, informs them that he is going to the forum (163), to the market to buy fish (169), thus motivating both his appearance and his exit. A less explicit motivation occurs when Pyrgopolinices (Miles 1. 1), immediately before he leaves, remarks (72-74):

Videtur tempus esse, ut eamus ad forum,
ut in tabellis quos consignavi hic heri
latrones, ibus denumerem stipendium.

This explains both his exit and his presence on the street.¹

A closely related type of motivation occurs when a character, as he leaves the house, explains more or less explicitly to someone inside where he is going. Thus Antipho (Stich. 1. 2), as he enters, gives directions to his slaves as to what they are to do in his absence, and informs them (66-67) that he is going to call on his elder daughter--if anyone asks for him, call him from there. Likewise, Geta (Phor. 1. 2) enters, remarking (51), Si quis me quaeret rufus . . . , when he is interrupted by Davus, who has just arrived.² However, the use of this device of having a character enter speaking to someone inside is not confined to motivation of entrance. Several times it is apparently employed merely to bring the character on the stage talking.³

Frequently the reason for the presence of a character is clear, though it is not explained by a definite statement. Here the reason for the character's presence can be inferred either

¹For other examples of motivation by explicit statement in dialogue, see Bac. 1. 2; Capt. 1. 2; Cas. 1. 1; Curc. 1. 1; Men. 11. 1; Most. 1. 4; Poen. 1. 1, 2; Rud. 1. 2.

²For other examples see Cas. 11. 1, 2; Truc. 1. 2; Hec. 1. 2; And. 1. 4.

³For examples of this use see Bac. 11. 2; Curc. 11. 1; Men. 1. 2; Trin. 1. 2; Hec. 11. 2; Heaut. 1. 2.

from what is said, or from the action. Micio (Ad. 1. 1) enters calling "Storax" (26); he then proceeds (26-27): non rediit hac nocte a cena Aeschinus neque servolorum quisquam, qui advorsum iverant. It is clear, then, that he has come out in search of his son, or of the advorsitores who would attend the son on his return from a late evening revel, and his anxiety motivates his soliloquy on the difficulties of parenthood. An excellent example is found in the Hecyra (1. 1, 2). Philotis and Syra are found in the opening scene discussing the proper conduct of a courtesan; upon Parmeno's entrance (76), and after greetings have been exchanged, Philotis inquires (97-98): sed quid hoc negotist modo quod narravit mihi hic intus Bacchis? From this casual question it can be inferred easily that they are returning from calling on Bacchis. The explanation of the presence of Philematium and Scapha (Most. 1. 3) can perhaps be gathered from Philematium's remarks on her desire to appear attractive to her lover (166-67, 248-49). At the opening of the Cistellaria (1. 1) Selenium, Gymnasium, and the Lena appear. From Gymnasium's compliment (10-11), ita in prandio nos lepide ac nitide accepisti apud te, ut semper meminerimus, we can infer that Gymnasium and the Lena are departing guests, and that Selenium, their hostess, has come out to see them off.¹

In a few cases the action itself sufficiently explains the presence of the character. At the opening of the Heauton (1. 1) Menedemus is found working in the field (cf. 67-69, 88-89). Euclio (Aul. 1. 1) drives Staphyla violently out of the house (40-42), and follows her out in the midst of his abuse. With

¹For other examples of inferred motivation see Curc. 11. 2; Epid. 1. 2; Most. 1. 1; Rud. 1. 1, 2; Truc. 1. 1; And. 1. 1; Heaut. 1. 1, 2; 11. 2; Eun. 1. 1, 2.

this may be compared Pseud. 1. 2 where Ballio, in a similar fashion (cf. 133) drives his household out of the house to give them instructions.¹

Finally, the reason for the appearance of a character, or if not the reason at least a statement of his expected appearance, may be given before the entrance of the character. This may be combined with a definite statement upon the entrance of the character, although this does not always occur, and, if the preparation is adequate, is scarcely necessary.² Lysidamus (Cas. 11. 3), for example, enters with no explicit explanation of his return home, but the audience has been prepared for his entrance by Pardalisca's remark, some time earlier (147), that he had ordered lunch to be ready for him. The situation is similar in the case of the entrance of Stratippocles and Chaeribulus (Epid. 1. 2), in which we have been led by Thesprio's report (cf. 67 ff.) to expect that Stratippocles would arrive shortly. A somewhat vague preparation is made for the entrance of Tyndarus, Philocrates, and the Lorarius in the Captivi (11. 1). In the preceding scene (1. 2) Hegio had instructed the Lorarius to allow the Captives to walk wherever they wished, either indoors or outdoors (114); thus their exit from the house occasions no particular surprise; in addition we learn later, upon the entrance of Hegio, that he had sent them out (cf. 252). Palaestra's appearance (Rud. 1. 3) is adequately explained by Sceparnio's description of the shipwreck in the preceding scene (cf. 160 ff.). The entrance of Cappadox (Curc. 11. 1) is sufficiently motivated by the earlier references to his incubatio (61-62), and to the opening of the doors of the

¹Cf. Asin. 1. 2; perhaps also Most. 1. 1.

²Cf. the remarks of T. B. L. Webster, "Preparation and Motivation in Greek Tragedy," Class. Rev., XLVII (1933), 118.

temple (203-4); Cappadox, in addition, mentions his incubatio upon his entrance (216 ff.). The audience is led to expect the immediate return of Demipho (Merc. ii. 1) by Acanthio's warning to Charinus against running into his father (cf. 219 ff.); Demipho himself explains his absence from home (cf. 255 ff.). Preparation for the return of Curculio (Curc. ii. 3) is made through the references to his trip to Caria and to his imminent arrival (cf. 67-68, 143-44, 206-7). Syrus and Dromo (Heaut. ii. 3) are expected, since the errand upon which they had gone has been previously mentioned (cf. 191, 175-76, 238 ff.).

